

VOLUME XIII

MARCH, 1927

NUMBER 3

# BULLETIN

OF

## THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
PRESIDENTIAL REPORTS

PUBLISHED BY  
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.  
EDITORIAL OFFICE, 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD  
CAMBRIDGE  
MASSACHUSETTS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Notes and Announcements

American Council on Education.....	159
Registration Statistics.....	159
Residence and Migration of University and College Students.....	159
Institute of International Education.....	160
International Conferences.....	160
International Relations Clubs.....	161
Association of American Colleges, <i>Bulletin Subscription</i> ..	161
Brief Notes.....	161

The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, <i>E. C. Hills</i> .....	163
--	-----

### Presidential Reports

Boston University.....	186
Columbia University.....	188
Harvard University.....	195
University of Pittsburgh.....	197
Princeton University.....	203

### Educational Discussion

Higher Education, Biennial Survey, <i>A. J. Klein</i> .....	207
Study of School, College, and University Athletics, <i>H. J. Savage</i> .....	217
The Liberal College, <i>George Norlin</i> .....	220

### Local and Chapter Notes

Arizona, Resignation of the President.....	225
Columbia, Course for Discussion Leaders.....	225
College of the City of New York, Chapter Recommendations.....	225
Ohio, Educational Conference.....	226
Western Reserve, The Hundredth Anniversary.....	227
Wisconsin, Academic Freedom.....	228

Nominations for Membership.....	233
---------------------------------	-----

## NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—The January report of the Executive Committee states that the cooperative experience with psychological tests has progressed until it has now become self-supporting, with a circulation in 1926 of 60,000 copies among 161 institutions.

The handbook of American Universities is expected to be ready for distribution before the close of the academic year and will contain information in regard to 400 institutions on the accredited list of the Council.

The fourteen institutions that cooperated in the Hopkins study of Personnel Methods have contributed written reports each on that phase of personnel work in which it is particularly expert. These monographs will appear in the *Educational Record*. The committee has formulated a plan for supplying colleges with record cards, forms for securing vocational information, achievement test blanks, etc.

REGISTRATION STATISTICS.—*School and Society* for January 8 contains the annual statistics of registration in American universities and colleges. Among the liberal arts colleges or departments, California leads with 9309, including the Southern Branch, followed by Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, and Illinois. California also leads in the enrolment of undergraduates and of women undergraduates separately. Massachusetts Institute of Technology has the largest total of engineering students, 2151, followed by Purdue 2067, and Illinois 1656. The largest law school is that of New York University, 1901, followed by Harvard 1440; in medicine, Pennsylvania has 609, Michigan 605. Among non-professional graduate schools Columbia is first, 2199, Chicago 1337, California 1298. Teachers College at Columbia University maintains its long lead among schools of education with 4191, the second being Ohio State, 1476. Of the Summer Schools in 1926, Columbia led with 13,219, followed by California 10,663, Chicago 6532, etc.

RESIDENCE AND MIGRATION OF UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE STUDENTS.—U. S. Bureau of Education, *Bulletin* No. 11, 1926, prepared by Dr. George F. Zook shows the number of students, men and women, respectively, who live in each state in the Union; the ratio which they bear to the total population; and the extent to

which they leave the state of their residence to secure a college education. The tables also show the number of students residing in each state who are enrolled in each of the major courses of study, and to what extent they remain at home in order to secure these courses of study. . . Only regular college students enrolled in courses of study above high-school grade have been counted.

All institutions of higher education listed by the Bureau of Education have been included in the compilation except the normal schools and teachers colleges. . .

"Perhaps the most interesting result of this study has been to ascertain the number of students residing in each state and the proportion which they bear to the total population. Utah leads all states in the number of college students residing in the state as compared to the total population, with one student for every 99 persons; the District of Columbia follows with one student for every 103; Oregon has one student for every 121 in the population, and Nebraska one student for every 126. The average for the entire country is one student to every 212 persons in population. . ."

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION.—*Handbook for American Students in France*. Dr. H. S. Krans, Associate Director of the Paris office, has included in this excellent pamphlet chapters on: Certain advantages of study in France; Hints to American students going to France; Preparatory school work and undergraduate study; An outline of the French educational system; Conditions and formalities of admission to French universities, tuition fees, certificates, diplomas, and equivalences; Parisian institutions; Leading subjects of study. Copies of the pamphlet may be obtained by application to the Institute at 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

The Institute has issued leaflets on Summer Schools in Foreign Countries, 1927, including Oxford, Berlin, Heidelberg, Vienna, Madrid, and various universities in France; on Franco-American Exchange Scholarships; on Fellowships in Czechoslovakia; and on Assistantships in French Schools for American Men.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES.—*School and Society* for January 29 includes announcements in regard to the World Federation of Education Associations Conference at Toronto, August 7-12, an International Education Conference at Prague, April 18 and 19, to discuss the promotion of peace throughout the schools of the



world, and on the Fourth International Conference of the New Education Fellowship at Locarno, August 3-15.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CLUBS.—The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace reports the existence of 107 international relations clubs in different colleges during the academic year 1925-6. The clubs are organized by and for undergraduates, but there is in each case a faculty adviser. The purpose is defined in the preamble of an illustrative constitution, as follows:

Realizing the importance of a knowledge of our country's international affairs, and feeling the need of systematic study of the problems which are constantly confronting the American people, we do, hereby, associate ourselves together for the purpose of studying and discussing those national and international events and issues which are daily transpiring within and without our national borders and which vitally concern our American life and institutions. It is our intention to deal with all questions and topics in an impartial and non-partisan manner, always endeavoring to search out and appreciate the truth of each situation under investigation. We further declare it to be our ambition to maintain a broadmindedness and a fair judgment in discussing our national and international problems, and thus better fit ourselves, as college men, to take an intelligent and effective part in forwarding the interests of our country and our several communities.

The coordinating office in New York is conducted by Miss Amy Heminway Jones, 405 West 117th Street.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES.—*Bulletin Subscriptions.* The Association of American Colleges sends its quarterly bulletin regularly to presidents and deans of institutions in its membership. With a view to extending its circulation and making its valuable reports accessible to members of faculties generally, the executive committee has recently decided to accept subscriptions from faculty members of institutions in the Association at \$1.00 for two years, or club orders for two or more subscriptions for one year at fifty cents each; the ordinary subscription rate being \$3.00 per year. Address Secretary R. L. Kelly, 111 Fifth Ave., New York City.

BRIEF NOTES.—*United States Bureau of Education. Bulletin* No. 16, 1926, is a handbook of educational associations and foundations in the United States, arranged alphabetically with descriptive

paragraphs and numerous cross-references likely to be of service in identification.

*Bulletin* No. 19, 1926, is a statistical summary of education for 1923 and 1924. Among items of interest are total gifts and bequests to education, increasing from \$8,000,000 in 1871; \$7,000,000 in 1881; \$8,000,000 in 1891; \$21,000,000 in 1901; \$27,000,000 in 1911; to \$83,000,000 in 1924.

## THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The stated requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the universities of the United States are everywhere essentially the same, namely the prerequisite of the bachelor's degree, followed by approximately three years of graduate work. The graduate work includes not only attendance at lectures and research seminars, but also the preparation of a dissertation which shall embody the result of original investigation. Lastly, there is an oral examination before a committee of the faculty.

In certain details, however, there is a considerable difference in methods of procedure. This is especially true in the matter of the so-called minor subjects, and in the conduct of examinations. In order to obtain data regarding these two points, a questionnaire was sent out in May, 1926, and the following article is largely based on the replies that were received.

The following universities replied (the names of the persons replying are given in parenthesis. The term "Dean" refers in each case to the Dean of the Graduate School, or the Graduate Division): University of California (Chas. B. Lipman, Dean); University of Chicago (G. J. Laing, Dean; R. V. Merrill, Secretary of the Department of Romance Languages; E. H. Wilkins, Dean of the Colleges); University of Colorado (O. C. Lester, Dean); Columbia University (printed bulletins); Cornell University (R. A. Emerson, Dean); Harvard University (Charles H. Grandgent, Chairman of the Division of Modern Languages; C. H. Haskins, former Dean; G. L. Kittredge, former Chairman of the Division of Modern Languages; A. Lawrence Lowell, President of the University; William B. Munro, Chairman of the Division of History, Government, and Economics; G. W. Robinson, Secretary of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences); University of Illinois (Arthur H. Daniels, Dean); Indiana University (Fernandus Payne, Assistant Dean); University of Iowa (C. V. Siebers, Dean); Johns Hopkins University (Joseph S. Ames, Dean); University of Kansas (E. B. Stouffer, Dean); University of Michigan (Alfred H. Lloyd, Dean); University of Minnesota (Guy Stanton Ford, Dean); University of Missouri (Robert J. Kerner, Acting Dean); University of Nebraska (L. A. Sherman, Dean); Ohio State University (W. McPherson, Dean); University of Pennsylvania (Herman V. Ames, Dean); Princeton University (E. C. Armstrong, Professor of Romance Languages; A. B. Creasy, Secretary

of the Graduate School); Stanford University (E. C. Franklin, Dean); University of Texas (Henry W. Harper, Dean); University of Virginia (J. C. Metcalf, Dean); University of Wisconsin (C. S. Slichter, Dean); Yale University (Wilbur L. Cross, Dean).

The questionnaire was sent to a few other universities that did not reply.

## I

## THE MINOR SUBJECT OF A CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1. *Does Your Graduate School Require Both a Major and a Minor Subject?*

No minor required: Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Yale ("but the student's work covers a group of related subjects of which one is more prominent than the rest. Thus, a candidate specializing in French must have a knowledge of the languages and literatures of the other Romance languages and of Latin also").

One minor required: California ("one or two minor subjects"), Illinois ("may choose two"), Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Stanford, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin; but the minor may be waived at Stanford and Washington.

Two minors required: Colorado, Cornell, Indiana, Kansas, Texas. A second minor may be taken at Washington.

a. *If so, may both be taken in one department?*

Yes (if the major department is large): California (but "normally not"), Colorado, Cornell, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Ohio, Stanford, Texas ("the second minor must be taken in another related department"), Virginia, Washington.

No: Illinois, Missouri, Wisconsin.

*Note.*—The present tendency seems to be toward doing away with the requirement of formal minors. None is required at Chicago (since 1926), Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins (since 1926), Michigan, Pennsylvania, Princeton, and Yale, and by recent legislation the requirement of a minor may now be waived at Stanford and Washington.

In universities where most of the departments have small staffs, one or even two formal minors in separate departments may be advisable, but in universities with strong, well-manned departments the formal minor is quite unnecessary. In the latter case, the best

procedure seems to be as follows: "The usual practice (at Harvard) is to require 'a general field' and a 'special field,' *i. e.*, a broad preparation covering something outside the candidate's own department and a specialized preparation within." (William B. Munro.) "The department (at Johns Hopkins) in which a student works for his principal subject or the professor under whom his dissertation work is being done has complete authority to advise the student to take whatever allied subjects are deemed necessary, and to whatever extent." (Joseph S. Ames.) At Chicago "the work required includes such courses in departments allied to that of principal work as may be deemed necessary by the principal department." At Michigan "our work calls for a major and for work in cognate branches rather than in minors so-called." (Alfred H. Lloyd.)

2. *Is the Amount of Work that Must Be Done in the Minor Subject Left to the Discretion of the Department in Which It Is Taken?*

No: California, Colorado, Cornell, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin.

Yes: Kansas, Michigan, Stanford, Texas ("to the members of the candidate's supervisory committee who represent the department").

a. *Is it left to the candidate's committee?*

Yes: Ohio, Missouri (or "to his major professor"), Texas, Virginia, Washington.

No: California ("not wholly"), Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska (it is left to the "major professor," and the dean of the graduate school), Stanford, Wisconsin.

3. *Or Is the Amount of Work that Must Be Done in the Minor Subject Definitely Prescribed by General Administrative or Legislative Rules?*

Yes: California (see b), Cornell ("ordinarily about one-half the work should be done in the major and about one-fourth in each minor"), Illinois, Iowa (usually "two-fifths of the graduate work shall be done in the major and one-fifth in the minor"), Minnesota (see b), Missouri ("usually about one year"), Ohio ("one-fifth in minor subject, but this is interpreted in a liberal way"), Stanford (one-fifth in minor subject if there is a minor), Texas ("first minor, three-fifteenths, second minor, two-fifteenths of the total amount of work required"), Virginia ("at least one year of graduate work" in minor subject), Wisconsin ("one-fourth to one-third of student's effort").

No: Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, Washington.

a. *If so, are definite courses prescribed for the minor in each department?"*

No: All except California and Iowa, where definite courses are prescribed in some departments.

b. *Or, is a definite number of semester "hours," or "units" or equivalent courses prescribed?*

Yes: California ("the content of at least twelve units"), Colorado (the minimum amount of work is prescribed), Illinois ("not less than four units"), Minnesota ("a minimum of 18 to 21 quarter credits = 12 to 14 semester hours"), Virginia ("at least three session hours, but seminar work has no evaluation, of course, in terms of hours").

No: Cornell, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Stanford, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin.

*Note.*—In a letter of date June 8, 1926, President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University says:

"When a student comes to real graduate work, he ought to have nothing further to do with credits in courses, or with credits of any kind. He ought to be examined upon his command of the subject as a whole, and his capacity of dealing with it, and if possible of contributing to it. I feel that one of the grave defects of American education is that in college we continue to use secondary school methods, and in graduate work we use methods that ought to have been left behind before the bachelor's degree is attained."

Many of us are doubtless in full agreement with Mr. Lowell that in our undergraduate colleges the quantitative plan of evaluating work done should be replaced at the earliest possible moment by a qualitative plan, and it is my personal opinion that the change should be effected at the beginning of the Junior Year. With regard to graduate work, a study of the replies to the present questionnaire indicates that the quantitative plan prevails only indirectly, if at all, in the major or principal work of candidates for the doctor's degree. Although the replies to the questionnaire may not make it clear, I happen to know that in some graduate schools, certain courses in the major subject are required of all candidates for the degree. This might be interpreted as, in part, a quantitative requirement, but the fact that a candidate may have passed these courses satisfactorily does not, as a rule, exempt him from a qualitative test. I am of the opinion, however, that the requirement of specific courses with a definite grade of, say, A, B, or C, does tend in some degree to keep alive the spirit of the prevalent undergraduate quantitative system.

Some of the universities that require of the candidate for the



doctor's degree one or more minor subjects seem to have real difficulty in breaking away from the quantitative system, in so far as it applies to the minor subject. Thus, from one-fourth to one-third of the candidate's time must usually be given to the minor subject at Cornell, Iowa, Ohio, Stanford, Texas, Wisconsin. And a definite number of courses or "hours" in the minor is prescribed at California, Colorado, Illinois, Minnesota, and Virginia.

I agree with Mr. Lowell that it would be better if all quantitative requirements for the doctor's degree, both in the major and in the minor subjects, were abolished. A few years ago I read the announced requirement for the master's degree at the University of London. If I remember rightly it was as follows: "A knowledge of the ancient literatures of Greece and Rome." It would be difficult to formulate more clearly a qualitative requirement for an advanced degree.

## II

### EXAMINATION OF CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1. *Are the Doctoral Examinations in Your Graduate School Given by a Committee Composed Exclusively of Members of the Department in Which the Degree Is To Be Taken?*

No: All, except Princeton ("usually by the departments, but not necessarily"), Yale ("usually unless the departments are very closely related. The departments of Philosophy and Psychology meet together for the examination of candidates in either subject," etc.).  
*a. Or by a committee with members from two or more departments?*

Yes: California, Chicago, Colorado, Columbia, Cornell ("from one or more, usually more departments"), Harvard ("by members of a division. A division includes two or more departments. Occasionally members from outside the division are brought in"), Illinois, Indiana, Iowa ("six members of the major department, two of the minor, and one from each of the two other academic groups: science, historical, philosophy, language and literature"), Johns Hopkins ("the written examinations are set by the professor concerned, the oral examinations are held before one of the two sections of the faculty, either philosophical or scientific"), Kansas, Michigan ("one to two members from outside"), Minnesota ("usually at least three departments, or at least the major and minor, with outside representatives of the graduate school"), Missouri, Nebraska ("not less



than eight members to represent every branch of the major and the minor subjects. The Dean adds a member to represent the Graduate Council, and such other persons as seem necessary to give authority to the committee as a whole"), Ohio ("the committee consists of representatives of the departments in which the major and minor work is taken, and also three representatives of the Graduate Council"), Pennsylvania ("usually"), Texas, Virginia ("to the committee from the candidate's department is added a member of the Administrative Graduate Committee whose work is cognate with that of the department in which the candidate has done his major study"), Washington ("the committee is composed of at least three members of the major department and one or more members of the minor department, with an independent representative of the Graduate Council, the Dean or some representative appointed by him"), Wisconsin. At Stanford, the examinations "are conducted by a representative of the Committee on Graduate Study."

*Note.*—It is evident from the foregoing paragraph that doctoral examinations are regularly conducted by members of two or more departments. If the candidate has one or more minor subjects, both the major and the minor departments are represented on the committee. If the university has the system of divisions—composed of two or more related departments—the committee is selected from the division. Apparently, where the departments are grouped in divisions, no formal minors are required. In certain universities (Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Stanford, Virginia, Washington, and probably others), the committee has one or more members who are the official representatives of the Dean of the Graduate School, or of the "Graduate Council" (or the "Administrative Graduate Committee," or the "Committee on Graduate Study").

It is never safe to generalize, but I am of the opinion that the older and stronger the graduate school may be, the more able and experienced men it has on its staff, and the more firmly traditions of thorough and accurate work have been established, the less need there is of protecting the standards of the university by having present at the examinations one or more representatives of the Dean or the Graduate Council.

There is a marked note of satire in a letter, of date May 31, 1926, that was received from Mr. J. McK. Cattell, editor of *Science*, and formerly a professor in Columbia University, but there is also a kernel of truth, when he says:

"It has always been my opinion that the less formal the requirement for the doctor's degree the better. If it is regarded as desirable to have some police supervision to keep departments up to a certain standard, then it seems to me that an oral examination should consist of questions before the faculty, to be answered not by the student but by the professor who is responsible for recommending the granting of a degree."

In practice this would mean that when the professor who is in charge of the candidate's major work decided to recommend the granting of the degree, the committee would be called together and there would be a general questioning of the professor to ascertain his knowledge of the subject. If the professor satisfied the examiners, his recommendation would be accepted and the degree would be granted to the student candidate. If the professor failed to satisfy the examiners, the degree would be withheld.

Although Mr. Cattell's suggestion is certainly made in a spirit of irony, it does contain an element of wisdom. If, for instance, the candidate for the degree desired to do his major work with a professor whose competency was held in doubt by those in authority, there might be a real advantage in requiring the professor to prove his competency in public examination before allowing him to take charge of the candidate's work. But, of course, nothing of the sort will ever be done for very obvious reasons.

2. *Are There Both a Preliminary and a Final Examination?*

Yes: California, Colorado, Columbia (in some divisions, before admission to candidacy), Cornell ("but the committee may waive the preliminary if they are fully satisfied with the candidate's progress"), Harvard (called "General" and "Special" examinations. But in some divisions—Modern Languages, for instance—there is no preliminary examination), Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Stanford, Washington, Wisconsin, Yale.

No: Chicago, Indiana, Texas.

No rule: Johns Hopkins ("in some departments there are two types of examinations, but there is no rule concerning this"), Virginia.

a. *If so, how much time must elapse between the two?*

One year: Colorado, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard ("ordinarily a year, often more, occasionally less"), Illinois, Iowa, Kansas ("ordinarily twelve months, but at least seven months"), Missouri, Nebraska, Princeton, Stanford, Wisconsin, Yale.

Seven months: Kansas (see above), Michigan, Minnesota ("formerly one year. Changed in order to permit candidates transferring from other institutions to qualify in one academic year"), Ohio ("two and a half quarters").

Six months: Pennsylvania, Washington.

Four months: California ("at least four months or one term").

*Note.*—In general some sort of "preliminary" ("primary," "first part," or "general") examination is required, either before or after admission to candidacy, and at a more or less definite period of time before the candidate may present himself for the final examination. The period of time varies from four, six, or seven months, to a year or more. Twelve universities of those considered in this report require a period of at least twelve months between the two examinations. Seven universities require a shorter period, while three or four do not give preliminary examinations.

The significant feature of these data is that, in the majority of the universities considered, migration from one university to another is rendered well-nigh impossible by the requirement that the candidate shall take a preliminary doctoral examination twelve months before coming up for the final. There may be cases where a graduate student from one university would present himself at another in May and ask to be allowed to take the preliminary examination, but such cases must be exceedingly rare if they ever occur at all. If a preliminary examination is held twelve months before the final, the candidate is virtually required to spend the last two years of his graduate work at the university where he takes his degree. Thoughtful critics of our graduate schools have frequently expressed the opinion that lack of migration is one of the chief defects of our present system of training men for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. With this opinion I am in hearty accord and I believe that any rule that hampers migration is harmful. The very opposite of migration is found where a student does his four years of undergraduate work and his three years of graduate work in the same university. Whenever, for some special reason, a student plans to take both his A.B. and his Ph.D. degrees at one and the same place, he should be required to spend at least one year at another university in America or in Europe. In the foreign modern language departments of the University of California there is an unwritten law that the candidate for the doctor's degree must study in Europe for at least one year, and this rule has worked well.

3. *If There Is a Preliminary Examination, Is It Written, or Oral, or Both?*

Oral: Harvard (but sometimes both written and oral), Stanford, Yale ("usually, but it may be written or oral, or partly written and partly oral").

Written: Johns Hopkins, Michigan ("usually written, but may be supplemented by an oral examination at the discretion of the committee"), Nebraska, Ohio ("generally written" but may be oral or both oral and written).

Written, or oral, or both: Colorado, Columbia, Cornell, Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin.

Written, or oral; not both: California.

Both: Iowa, Kansas.

a. *If both, how much time is assigned to each?*

Time not prescribed: California, Colorado, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard ("on the average, about three hours written and two hours oral," if both are given), Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota ("varies by departments, written usually covers two days and oral three hours"), Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin ("varies from one-half to two days").

Princeton ("the First Part—Preliminary Examination—shall extend over not more than three consecutive days of six sessions of oral examination, or four written examinations, or a combination of the two, one hour of oral being equivalent to two hours of written"); Missouri ("four to eight hours"); Yale (two hours for an oral, or four hours for a written examination. If both, one hour for the oral and three hours for the written examination).

4. *Is the Final Examination Written, or Oral, or Both?*

Oral: California, Chicago, Colorado, Columbia, Harvard, Indiana, Kansas ("may be both"), Michigan, Minnesota ("unless some essential part of the candidate's major field was not covered in the preliminary examination"), Missouri, Princeton, Stanford, Virginia, Washington (but may be oral and written), Wisconsin, Yale (usually, but it may be oral, or written, or both).

Both: Illinois ("may be both"), Iowa, Johns Hopkins, Nebraska, Ohio, Texas.

Oral, or written, or both: Cornell, Pennsylvania.

a. *If both, how much time is assigned to each?*

Not specified: Cornell, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Pennsylvania.

At Johns Hopkins "the written examination is supposed to be limited, not more than three hours being given to any one paper. The oral examination is for one hour." At Nebraska "there are a written examination of from four to six hours in the major subject, and two to four hours in the minor subject, and an oral examination of from two to four hours." At Ohio "the written examination may extend over one or two days. The oral generally extends for about two hours—there is no definite time limit." At Texas "written examinations: major, four hours; first minor, four hours; second minor, three hours. Oral, in the discretion of the committee." At Yale, "as for the preliminary examination."

*Note.*—In the majority of our universities the final examination is oral and public. The preliminary examination, if there be one, may be oral, or written, or both, but usually either all or a part is written. As the preliminary examination, in a large proportion of the graduate schools, seems to be a sort of qualifying test, it is well to make it written, but as a part of the preliminary examination the candidate should appear before a committee in order that his general intelligence may be judged. This is especially important when the candidate has transferred from another institution. And such students should always have the privilege of taking the preliminary or qualifying examination at the beginning of the last year.

5. *Must the Dissertation be Accepted by the Committee before the Candidate Is Admitted to the Final Examinations?*

Yes: California, Chicago, Colorado ("in so far as the content is concerned. It need not be in final form"), Columbia, Cornell ("ordinarily yes, but the rule is waived by the dean in special cases"), Harvard, Indiana, Johns Hopkins, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Princeton, Stanford, Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Yale ("it must be satisfactory to the reader").

No: Illinois (it is "formally accepted at the examination"), Iowa ("by the chairman and only tentatively"), Pennsylvania ("the thesis may be completed later, but usually is completed before the final examination").

6. *Must the Candidate Bind Himself to Publish the Dissertation within a Given Time?*

Yes: Columbia, Indiana, Iowa, Johns Hopkins, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Washington ("the University assumes the responsibility. The candidate contributes \$100"), Wisconsin, Yale.



No: California, Chicago ("he must present to the library three typed copies, and to the University Press an abstract to be printed in an annual volume of Ph.D. dissertation abstracts. He pays for the printing of his abstract \$5.00 per page of 400 words"); Colorado, Cornell, Harvard, Illinois ("the candidate must deposit with the Dean an abstract of his thesis in condition for publication at a cost not to exceed \$75.00 unless the thesis is published by the author. The \$75 is paid by the candidate"), Stanford, Texas, Virginia.

a. *If so, how soon after receiving the degree?*

Columbia ("in some departments, before the degree is granted, in others soon thereafter"), Indiana ("within two or three years"), Iowa ("three years"), Johns Hopkins ("within a year, but if necessary an extension of time is allowed"), Kansas ("two years"), Michigan ("no time limit is set"), Minnesota ("one year"), Missouri ("within about a year"), Nebraska ("one year"), Ohio ("two years"), Pennsylvania ("either before, or present a printer's contract or acceptance from a publisher, or adequate deposit"), Princeton ("one year"), Wisconsin ("one year"), Yale ("within a reasonable period, which is interpreted to mean three years").

*Note.*—Almost without exception the dissertation must be accepted before the candidate is admitted to the final examination. In some universities—probably in more than the data given above would indicate—the dissertation is accepted tentatively, in that the candidate may revise it—and frequently is advised to do so before it goes to press.

The universities are divided in requiring, or not requiring, the printing of the dissertation. The drift seems to be away from this requirement, as several universities that formerly required the printing of the dissertation no longer do so. The plan of publishing abstracts or digests of dissertations, which has been adopted at Chicago and Illinois, is interesting. Two volumes of such digests have been published by Chicago, and I am told that it is planned to get out such a volume in each general field about once every four years. The average length of the digests is eight pages.

7. *If There Are Both a Preliminary and a Final Examination, Is There a Thorough General Questioning of the Candidate at the Preliminary Examination?*

Yes: California, Colorado, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard ("sometimes three hours of it—and a lot of questions can be asked in three hours. Very few candidates who pass this examination fail on their

finals"), Illinois, Iowa, Johns Hopkins ("if there is one"), Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio ("the main function of the preliminary examination is to enable us to decide definitely whether or not the student should be encouraged to continue his graduate work"), Pennsylvania ("the object of the preliminary examination is to ascertain the extent of the applicant's attainments within a considerable range of subjects in the field of the major"), Princeton, Stanford, Virginia ("the preliminary examination is termed 'general comprehensive examination,' and deals with the background with a view largely to determine the candidate's preparation for advanced graduate work"), Washington, Wisconsin, Yale ("it is a severe ordeal").

✓ *a. If so, is there another general questioning at the final examination?*

Yes: California ("but more emphasis is placed on thesis work"), Colorado, Cornell, Illinois, Iowa, Johns Hopkins ("at least the oral part"), Nebraska, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Virginia ("but much more intensive"), Wisconsin.

No: Columbia, Harvard ("the special examination is confined to the candidate's special or major field"), Kansas ("general questioning is permitted, but is not customary if the preliminary examination has been wholly satisfactory"), Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Stanford, Washington ("if the preliminary examination was in all respects satisfactory, the final examination shall be on the field of the thesis and such courses as were taken subsequent to the preliminary examination"), Yale.

✓ *b. Or is the final examination devoted primarily to a defense of the thesis?*

Yes: Columbia, Kansas, Michigan ("a final examination is mainly on the thesis, but any member of the committee may ask any questions whatsoever"), Minnesota ("reserved for the defense of the thesis and questioning in the special field in which it falls"), Stanford ("the final is confined largely to the field of the dissertation"), Washington (see also 7, *a*), Yale ("to a defense of the dissertation and questions related to the dissertation").

No: California (see *a*), Chicago, Colorado (only in part), Cornell ("rarely"), Harvard, Illinois, Iowa, Johns Hopkins, Missouri ("to the special field in which the thesis is written and to the thesis"), Nebraska (only in part), Ohio, Pennsylvania, Princeton ("only incidentally"), Texas, Virginia, Wisconsin.

*Note.*—Attention has already been called to the fact that the preliminary examination in many universities is essentially a qualify-



ing test that is given to enable the committee to decide whether or no the student is fit, by nature and by training, to do research work. With the varying standards of scholarship in our many colleges and universities, such a test may well be requisite, and especially so when graduate students migrate from one university to another. At the preliminary examination, therefore, the candidate is expected to undergo a thorough general questioning, which shall determine, in so far as is possible, not only what he has read understandingly, but also whether he can think clearly.

In the majority of universities that were consulted there is, or there may be, another general questioning at the final examination. This is, in large part, due to the fact that the examiners are at liberty to ask any questions that they may wish to ask. But, at the same time, the data show a marked tendency to restrict the final oral examination to the candidate's more intensive work in the special or major field. This seems wise, providing there has been a thorough preliminary examination, for it would be quite futile to undertake to decide, at the last moment, and for the second time, whether or no the student is fit, by nature and by training, to do research work.

The custom of devoting the final examination primarily to a defense of the thesis is not general in this country, although seven graduate schools report that they do so, and several others state in their replies that the defense of the thesis is included, more or less incidentally, in the discussion of the special or major field.

8. *Are the Questions Asked at the Examinations, Excluding Those that Refer to the Thesis, Chiefly Such as Test the Candidate's Memory of What He Has Read (that is to say, are they primarily informational)?*

Yes: Chicago, Cornell ("but the aim ordinarily seems to be to question the candidate in such a way as to learn whether he can think clearly"), Indiana, Johns Hopkins ("but the questions asked in the written examinations are not of a problem type as a rule, nor are they of the type which could be answered simply by memorizing. In many cases reference to books is allowed"), Missouri, Nebraska (in large part).

No: California, Colorado, Harvard ("quite the contrary. They are the kind that a graduate student would ask his professor in a Seminar. In the words of the requirements, the candidate must 'show such proficiency as would enable him to give instruction to mature students.' " "But the Committees have no patience with candidates whose ideas and theories are not based on a solid knowl-

edge of the pertinent facts." "The questions cover information, bibliography, and power of thinking in the field of study"), Iowa ("as a rule, not"), Minnesota ("in the preliminaries they are informational, bibliographical, and a test of the candidate's ability to do some analytical and also synthetic thinking. There are in general too few skilled questioners"), Ohio ("every effort is made to determine the candidate's ability to reason and 'to think on his feet.' Of course, one cannot exclude memory questions entirely"), Pennsylvania ("rather grasp of subject judgment than memory"), Princeton ("in the First Part this element is given an important place, in the Second Part a very subordinate place," in the Romance Languages), Texas, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Yale.

9. *Are the Questions Asked at the Examinations, Excluding Those that Refer to the Thesis, Chiefly Such as Test the Candidate's Ability to Find without Delay and Use with Judgment the Best Works of Reference or Other Sources that are Available?*

Yes: California.

In part: Colorado ("tested by questions that can be answered without actual demonstration"), Iowa ("in large part"), Minnesota, Pennsylvania ("these are included and made a feature"), Washington, Wisconsin.

No: Cornell, Harvard ("but bibliographical questions are often asked, *e. g.*, 'Where would you go to look for such-and-such?' " "Such questions are important, but I should not say that they constitute the chief part of an examination. We expect a scholar to be more than a bibliographer"), Johns Hopkins, Missouri ("unfortunately, no!"), Nebraska, Ohio, Princeton ("chiefly no, but a substantial place is given to this in both examinations"), Stanford, Texas, Virginia.

*Note.*—The questions numbered 8 and 9 are so worded that it is difficult or impossible to answer them with yes or no. A study of all the replies that were received makes it clear, however, that although the questions asked at the examinations may be largely such as test the candidate's memory of what he has read, they are, or should be, such as test also his ability to judge critically and use correctly the information that he has acquired in his reading and in lectures. In these respects the final oral examination is, and rightly so, less "informational" than the preliminary test.

- a. *If so, do the examinations include practical tests of the candidate's ability to do this (such a test, for instance, as giving him certain ques-*

*tions of fact to answer and allowing him an hour or two in which to consult authorities and gather data?*

No: California ("not in this way, but in similar ways"), Chicago, Colorado, Cornell ("this might work well, but I should not want to see it adopted as a requirement"), Harvard ("but it sounds interesting." George W. Robinson. "This idea strikes me as a good one." William B. Munro), Iowa, Minnesota ("would consider this admirable in most cases but difficult to do in the time limit and pressure of the examination of so many candidates as we have in a single month of May"), Missouri ("your suggestions under No. 9 should be worked out. I think there is much to be gained thereby"), Nebraska ("this would be likely to test the student's apperceptional as well as mnemonic gifts and powers"), Ohio, Stanford, Texas ("the plan seems to have real value, the degree of which would doubtless vary with departments. I am inclined to think, however, that the plan could be followed to advantage by all departments"), Virginia ("this has not been emphasized hitherto in doctoral examinations, but will be included hereafter in a final doctoral examination"), Washington ("we have not followed the procedure suggested, but I am much taken with it, and shall ask that it be tried out"), Wisconsin, Yale.

Yes: Pennsylvania ("frequently"), Princeton ("the Department of English follows this plan, giving the questions to the candidate several hours before the examination." The answers are given orally).

*Note.*—The use of practical tests to ascertain the candidate's ability to find without delay and use with judgment the best works of reference or other sources that are available is not widespread in our graduate schools. Princeton and Pennsylvania use such tests in some departments, and several of the replies that were received indicate that they will be used hereafter in other universities.

In the letter from President Lowell of Harvard University to which reference has already been made, Mr. Lowell says: "You ask me whether I approve of the plan mentioned in question 9—that is, measuring the candidate's ability to find without delay, and use with judgment, the best works of reference or other sources that are available. No doubt a student ought to know the literature of his subject; but as to practical tests, I have had no experience, and I should somewhat doubt their value, because they would be in the main of authorities referring to current codified knowledge."

Mr. Lowell would be fully justified in doubting the value of such a test if the candidate were permitted to refer to encyclopedias or other works of "current codified knowledge." The test would have real value only in case the candidate consulted the latest authoritative books and articles.

Some of the correspondents, besides answering the questionnaire, sent additional statements with regard to the conduct of doctoral examinations. In so far as this material has not been incorporated in the preceding pages of this article, it is given below in separate form.

California: "At the preliminary examination the committee gives the candidate a thorough, searching examination on his general scholarship in the field of the major and of the minor. This examination is specific and detailed as well as general, but does not, unless special occasion arises therefore, concern itself with a discussion of the candidate's thesis. The representatives of the major subject usually consume approximately two-thirds of the period of the examination for questions in that field, and the representatives of the minor subject take the balance of the time of the examination period.

"At the final public oral examination, which normally covers a period of two to three hours, the candidate is thoroughly examined on his thesis and is expected to be prepared to defend the methods employed in the thesis work, his interpretation of the work of others bearing on his thesis, and the results which he himself has obtained together with his interpretation of them. While this forms the chief part of the final public examination, fully one-third of the period allowed is given to an examination of the candidate with respect to his views on scholarly investigation in general and with respect to his fitness for conceiving new projects in research and for carrying them through independently. This University takes the attitude that the final public oral examination is a desirable test to give to any candidate for the degree, to determine his fitness as a scholar, his ability to defend a thesis, and his capacity for meeting unexpected questions with the readiness of a well-trained scholar and investigator." Chas. B. Lipman, Dean.

Colorado: "The preliminary examination is very searching. The candidate may pass satisfactorily in all respects or he may show weaknesses in certain fields which are not too serious for him to overcome within a year. In such a case he is allowed to come up at

the end of the year for his final, provided his thesis is acceptable. If his preliminary examination is poor, he is not allowed to attempt the final at the end of a year. . . This prevents disappointments at the last minute and also relieves professors of the tendency to pass students who are just on the line.

"The final examination is oral and open to visitors. It is given by the professors in charge of the major and the two minors with the addition of two professors appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. The thesis is passed upon by this Committee. Our scheme seems to work well especially as all departments now refuse permission to take the examinations unless they are fairly sure that the candidate can make a good showing. We have turned down two candidates on preliminaries and one on the final so far this year. It is pretty well understood now among graduate students that it is of no use to come up unless they are thoroughly ready." O. C. Lester, Dean.

Illinois: "In recent years we have tended to make the preliminary a fairly rigorous inquisition into acquired knowledge in a major and two minors, with stiff probing at some points. On the final we more and more tried to test power to think, to 'defend' the thesis, and to relate one thing to another, though of course acquisition of facts is tested there constantly too. On the final, we tested general information and ideas on all sorts of subjects—lest we be ashamed. I believe in flunking a man on shockingly inadequate general information outside his field." Stuart Sherman (former Chairman of the Department of English in the University of Illinois and late literary editor of the *New York Herald Tribune*).

Iowa: "Our qualifying examination has two elements of flexibility. One is that it may be taken in connection with the master's degree and the other is that if the candidate has practically covered his course work by the time the qualifying examination is taken and the examination is very good, the written examination may count as the final written, but the final oral must always be taken." C. V. Siebers.

Johns Hopkins: "On the oral examination, in which all the members of a large group may take part, the student is tested upon his readiness to answer rather unexpected questions and to debate certain points. Some of our professors always ask questions to indicate a man's readiness to debate questions on the border of his subject that show his general knowledge rather than specific." Joseph S. Ames.



Nebraska: "I think the examination of a doctoral candidate should be searching enough to make it clear to him what his pretensions to scholarship really amount to. It should be conducted from the point of view of the men who have been where the candidate is, and have grown out of the academic perspective. Too many Doctors of Philosophy try to run, all their lives, on the prestige of having once studied in the University and on the capital of having got by with their professors at the time of their examination." I. A. Sherman.

Harvard: "In some divisions there is a partition of the examination, if I am not mistaken." (There is none in the division of Modern Languages.) The principal divisions (aside from Science) are: Modern Languages; Ancient Languages; History, Government, and Economics; Philosophy. There are also Fine Arts, Music, Mathematics. We are pretty well satisfied with the method pursued by our division, as affording a sufficient test with a minimum of machinery. If, however, the number of candidates should go on increasing, we might be forced to a mechanical splitting of the division staff into a number of small examining committees, as is done in the division of History, Government, and Economics.<sup>1</sup> As it is, all faculty members of the division are invited to attend, and we generally have ten or a dozen." Chas. H. Grandgent.

"I believe strongly in the plan of requiring every candidate to prepare himself and pass on subjects covering a fairly broad range, for example, six subjects drawn from two or three departments, a year before coming up for his special or major examination in a single subject. I believe in oral examinations conducted by a committee of five representing at least two, and usually more than two, departments, with four affirmative votes necessary to pass the candidate. There should be no 'set' questions but the committee should simply 'search' the candidate. Its aim should be to explore what he knows, not to uncover what he does not know. We are fairly well satisfied with the present system and contemplate no radical changes." William B. Munro.

"We give a Ph.D. degree in Philology—that is, Philology in the inclusive sense (language and literature). So far as the modern languages are concerned, degrees in Philology fall into the following classes: English Philology, German Philology, Romance Philology, Comparative Literature. In normal cases a candidate has had three

<sup>1</sup> The final published program of oral examinations in the Division of Modern Languages (1926) gives the names of sixteen candidates for the Ph.D. degree, thirteen in English and three in Romance. There had been "four examinations before this schedule, and two theses rejected."

years of graduate study, approved by the division of Modern Languages as satisfactory preparation for the degree. His thesis must be approved before he is admitted to the examination. In the division of Modern Languages there is no splitting of the Ph.D. examination into (1) a preliminary and (2) a final test. There is but one Ph.D. examination, and this comes at the very end of the student's course (usually in May or June of the year in which he takes his degree). It is oral. When a student comes up for this final examination we already know a great deal about him, for he has passed various regular examinations in regular courses of study.

"The Ph.D. examination is attended by such members of the division<sup>1</sup> as choose to come. Questions are asked without ceremony by anybody who feels the impulse. We do not divide the time into little bits and assign fifteen minutes to this subject, and fifteen minutes to that. Naturally some of the examiners ask more questions than others; but the whole procedure is, in this regard, informal; nobody need wait for anybody else, though, of course, the chairman guides the proceedings more or less, calling attention, for example, to the fact that 'we ought now to come down to some more modern period,' or the like. As a result of this informality the examinations are very interesting if the candidate is lively.

"The oral examination extends to at least three hours. It always includes searching questions on linguistic matters. It includes also a brief account given by the candidate of the subject of his dissertation—an account which is interrupted and followed by various questions relating to the subject. There are likewise questions on the literature of different periods. The object of all these questions is to test not merely the candidate's knowledge of literary history, but to find out how intimate his personal contact with literature has been; also to test his critical faculty as well as his knowledge. One important object of the examination is to enable the candidate to show how good an account he can give of himself *viva voce*—whether he can expound matters intelligibly and in good style, etc., etc.

"Obviously, not all periods of literature are covered minutely in every examination. Nevertheless, questions enough from all periods are asked to make the examination a satisfactory test. The candidate has the privilege of designating some period or topic on which he claims to be particularly well informed (for example, Elizabethan

<sup>1</sup> The division consists of all the members of the various departments of modern languages (English, French, German, etc.) as are members of the faculty. A dozen or fifteen would be an average attendance.



Drama). He may or may not be searchingly examined on that topic. If the wishes of the examiners lead them to ignore that subject and to apply their questions to other periods—why, then, of course, they have to assume that the man would have done well in this special field if they had chosen to test him there. Do not think, however, that it is regular to omit any period or department of the general subject. We manage somehow to cover the whole territory. Sometimes we go slowly and sometimes we gallop. Questions deal also with foreign literatures and foreign relations. There are also questions (a few) on history.

"In my opinion, the kind of examination which I have described has proved highly satisfactory. I particularly value the variety and informality of it. Candidate B. cannot infer from Candidate A.'s account just what is to confront him in the way of questions. Furthermore, the examiners are not bound and petrified by an inflexible program. You will observe that I have said nothing about *majors* and *minors*. We do not use those terms. Of course, in a subject like Romance Philology the candidate will know more about French literature, for example, than about Italian and Spanish, or more about Spanish and Italian than about French, and he is allowed to designate that language and literature with which he feels best acquainted. The examination always includes linguistics as well as literature. Nobody can dodge linguistics, even by coming up as a candidate in Comparative Literature. After the examination the division debates the whole question of the candidate's fitness for the Ph.D. Everybody is asked his views before a formal vote is taken. The debate includes a statement from the committee that has had the thesis.

"Of course, the candidate has to have a reading knowledge of French and German. This has to be certified by the chairman of the division before the candidate is admitted to the examination. If the chairman is not satisfied with the candidate's reading knowledge of these two languages, special examinations of a particular character are given. These have nothing to do with the general examinations described above.

"To sum up: Questions test knowledge of linguistic and literary history (facts and principles); the candidate's reading and thinking; his taste and appreciation; his judgment and critical faculty; his ability to give a good oral account of himself and of what he knows and thinks. Questions are very varied; some are minute, some gen-

eral, some specific, some vague. Some call for learning, some for nimbleness, some for thought." G. L. Kittredge.

Remarks. I am in thorough agreement with those who hold that the art of examining has not been sufficiently cultivated in the United States, and there is probably no art that is more difficult. It has been my observation that in doctoral examinations the committees almost invariably mean to be perfectly just both in the questioning of the candidate and in their judgment of his competency. But, nevertheless, the prejudices of examiners or their method of questioning may sometimes interfere with the exercise of absolute justice. This probably occurs rarely, and when it does occur it may be quite unintentional.

Committees may thus err in either one of several ways. The professor in charge of the candidate's work may be a man of influence in the university and one whose opinion carries great weight. The mere fact that he recommends the candidate for the doctor's degree may deter some members of the committee from asking questions that might seem to indicate doubt of the candidate's competency. The committee may, therefore, err on the side of leniency.

Or the committee may err on the other side. Let us assume, for instance, that some of the examiners happen to be familiar with certain fields in which they have been working of late. One of the examiners asks the candidate specific and detailed questions in the examiner's chosen field. Now the chances are that even the most competent candidate, if he is perfectly frank and sincere, will reply that he does not have all the details in mind and that there are doubtless recent articles on the subject that he has not yet had time to read. He may know where to go, however, and could examine and judge the latest findings and theories in a few hours. But the examiner presses the question and requires an immediate and exact answer. This puts the candidate in a dilemma. He can either acknowledge that he does not know the subject well enough to give an accurate answer, or he can guess. If his mental attitude is that of a true scholar, he will refuse to guess, and will reply simply that he does not know. If a second, and a third, and a fourth examiner follow in large part this method of questioning, the candidate will probably fail to satisfy the examiners, and the more the candidate is inclined to refuse to guess at the answers, the more likely he may be to fail.

While it is true that we should have no patience with candidates whose ideas and theories are not based on a solid knowledge of perti-

nent facts, yet it is equally true that no scholar can carry in his head all the details of his subject. He should, however, know where to turn at short notice in order to learn the latest word of those who speak with authority, and his judgment should be trained, in his own field at least, so that he can usually decide whether a statement is, or is not based on solid facts, and whether the deductions made from the data are, or are not, logically probable. The accumulation of facts in one's memory is, to a certain extent, quite necessary, but as all older scholars know, it is of secondary importance to the ability to find without delay and use with judgment the most authoritative books and articles that deal with a given subject.

There is a third way in which a committee may err in the conduct of oral examinations. The members of the committee, with the best intentions in the world, may lack experience and skill in examining, and may ask a series of more or less inconsequential questions of such a nature that the most competent candidate will flounder unless he possesses more than the average of self-confidence. These are the obviously crude ways in which committees may err. There is no question that committees do sometimes err in one or the other of these ways, but fortunately they do so infrequently. In universities where the art of conducting doctoral examinations has been highly developed and the examinations are conducted by able and experienced men, it may well be that the committees no longer err at all in these respects.

The candidate should be able to recognize and judge the findings of others, but most important of all is his ability to do accurate and thorough research of his own, to recognize new facts when he finds them, and to state his findings clearly and logically. All who have had experience in training candidates for the doctorate are only too well aware that it is often difficult to convince the student that he must make a serious and sincere attempt to read and understand every book and article that contains any material bearing on the subject of his dissertation. If he does not do so, he is liable to state as a fact something that has already been shown to be untrue, or he may announce as a new find something that another scholar published long before. Nothing is more destructive to the value of a doctoral dissertation than such slips.

It is my opinion that in this country too much importance is sometimes given to the final examination and too little to the dissertation, when deciding whether a candidate is, or is not, entitled to receive

the doctor's degree. If the final oral examination is in large part a test of the candidate's nimbleness of wit, of his ability to think quickly and express himself clearly, it will tend to eliminate the slow, plodding student. Perhaps this is well: I am not sure. We usually—and perhaps wisely—distrust such students when they are young, although we are sometimes forced to admire them when they reach maturity. I doubt, however, that any examination for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy can give the insight into the inner working of the candidate's mind that can be had from the careful reading of his dissertation. ✓

A final oral and public examination is doubtless salutary so far as the student is concerned, and it enables the committee to explore what the candidate knows outside the field of his dissertation. For these reasons, if for no others, it should be held. But it is the dissertation and not the examination which shows whether the candidate can do creative work of high order, and the ability and will to do such work is, after all, the supreme test of the candidate's fitness. ✓

E. C. HILLS.

University of California.

## PRESIDENTIAL REPORTS

BOSTON UNIVERSITY—REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT.—“I have earlier in this Report called attention to the need of a physical concentration of the Departments of Boston University. While waiting for the realization of that hope, I urge that we shall be diligent in overcoming the psychological dismemberment of Boston University. We need to emphasize and re-emphasize that this is a *University*, not merely an aggregation of separate and self-sufficient colleges and schools. . .

“In order to create this spirit of oneness, let me suggest:

“(a) A system of rotation should be worked out by the Trustees for service on the departmental standing committees so that in a given period of time each Trustee will be informed through experience concerning all the departments, and such a psychology will be created as will help him to understand that he is a Trustee of the University and not a special pleader for a particular department.

“(b) Frequent regular meetings of the faculties of the several departments should be held. The President of the University should preside at all these faculty meetings, as the By-Laws stipulate, and thus become a transmitter of the spirit and purpose of each faculty to all the others.

“(c) Frequent meetings should be held of the University Council, composed of the President and the Deans; and also of the President's Cabinet, composed not only of the Deans, but of all general University officers responsible to the President. This will furnish an opportunity for each officer to see over the rim of his own departmental interest, and to view the University as a whole. Any man who is not big enough not only to ply his own task with diligence, but also to see over the rim of that task is not big enough to be an officer of Boston University.

*Compulsory Military Drill Abolished.*—“Military drill was started as a compulsory course in Boston University College of Business Administration with the opening of the school year in 1918. As the time approached last spring for issuing the new catalogue, I felt that the time had come for the abolition of the compulsory feature—and it was abolished.

“My reasons for abolishing the compulsory feature may be succinctly stated as follows:

“1st. Because I am an American, and believe in America. I



am opposed to Russianizing, Prussianizing, or Europeanizing America. Compulsory military drill is foreign to the genius of America.

"2nd. Because I stand shoulder to shoulder with all good Americans in their opposition to war. Some feel that a high state of military preparedness is the best guarantee against war. I do not agree with them. It seems to me that an accurate reading of history shows that military preparedness creates the will to war instead of the will to peace. Just because America is rich and powerful is all the more reason why she should be an example to the rest of the world. This does not mean that I would not go to war when necessary. I am not a pacifist in the modern meaning of that term: If America's life or ideals should be imperiled, I would advocate the conscription of human life for their defense, and I would go further than that: I would insist upon the conscription of wealth and labor as the counterpart of the conscription of life.

"3rd. Because I believe in Boston University. It was not founded to train men to fight. It was chartered to 'promote virtue and piety, and learning in the languages and the liberal and useful arts and sciences.' It is set for an education that means unfolding of personality, the cultivation of ideals, the bestowal of vision, the clarifying of purpose, the strengthening of will, the development of power. Is it not an anomaly to require a young man to take two years of military drill before he can receive an academic degree from Boston University? In sticking to its business of education, the University serves the nation best. Government by force has become a tragic failure. Men are tired of physical domination. They are in mood to try out the ideal of government by instruction.

"4th. I am opposed to compulsory military drill because I try to be a Christian. I do not say that those who differ from me are not trying to be Christians. But I must make my actions square with my own best convictions. If I understand the spirit of Christianity, it is opposed to war, and the best interpreters of Christianity are opposed to a high state of military preparedness because, in the past, instead of guaranteeing peace it has only guaranteed war. The inspiration of our opposition to compulsory military drill does not come from the Russia of today—that it does is a charge too silly to be noticed. Our inspiration comes from the Palestine of long ago.

"I am not ignorant of the claims made for military drill. So far as I can gather, the arguments in its favor are three-fold:

"1st. It prepares the nation for defense. That is what the

militaristic nations of Europe claimed for their activities prior to 1914. The verdict of history is that they were preparing for war—and they got it! A much better defense would be for the youth of the world to take a course in international relations, which would be definitely directed to the study of the causes of war, the best ways of avoiding conflict when disputes arise, and the cultivation of understanding friendship and good-will, as means of establishing permanent peace.

"2nd. It helps to maintain discipline among the students. My own feeling is that the serious-minded young men who come to Boston University do not need to be controlled by military methods. We do not need to call in the War Department of the United States Government to assist us in maintaining discipline.

"3rd. It aids in character development in that it teaches the boy submission to authority, and at the same time, it is one of the best forms of physical exercise. These are the strongest arguments in favor of military drill, but even to this common consent is not given; for while producing pretty results for purposes of exhibition, it tends to force the individual student out of his natural rhythm and characteristic motion...

"However, the fact that we have allowed the course to remain as an optional one, and that it is paired with scientific physical training, shows that I am not rabid on the subject. I am perfectly willing to have all of our students take military drill if they choose to do so. My opposition is to the compulsory feature of it. As a matter of fact, about 80% of the men in the freshman class this year have elected the course in Military Science and Tactics. The army officer in command told me the other day that he noted a vast improvement in the morale of the Unit. He and you and I will all agree that it is better to have 80% of the men enrolled with 100% of cooperation and good-will, than to have 100% of the men with only 80% of cooperation and good-will. Any impartial judge will find that the whole situation is vastly improved by the abolition of the compulsory feature..."

D. L. MARSH.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—The annual report of the President of Columbia University contains an interesting analysis of its plan of government and administration, of which the following is an abridgment:



"In 1885 the trustees took steps definitely and permanently to subordinate financial administration to educational policy. It was formally provided that thereafter no trustee should be eligible to the office of Treasurer of the corporation and that the Treasurer, when chosen, should be elected for a fixed term. The chief concern of the trustees became, not the accumulation of their properties and the investment of their funds, but the maintenance in full vigor of a progressive educational system for which new and large sources of support must constantly be sought from a generous and appreciative public.

"The trustees have authority to direct and prescribe the course of study and the discipline to be observed in the college, to select and appoint a president of the college who shall hold his office during good behavior, together with such professors and tutors to assist the president in the government and education of the students as may be necessary, as well as such other officers as to the trustees shall seem meet. All of these officers hold office during the pleasure of the trustees. It is expressly provided that no professor, tutor, or other assistant officer shall be a trustee, thus making impossible the existence under the charter of a proprietary institution in any form whatsoever...

"When the college was small, the trustees met at irregular intervals and passed in minute detail upon every proposal having to do with college administration. Individual professors of strong personality frequently exercised much influence with the trustees, but the faculty as a body had very little real authority until the complete revision of the statutes which took place in 1890 and the years immediately following. These revised statutes transferred the right of initiative in everything that relates to educational policy to the faculties, or, in respect to certain matters, to the newly established university council. For more than thirty years, the trustees have not entertained, and would not think of entertaining, any motion or resolution having to do with educational policy (other than one to institute an inquiry) that did not bear on its face the fact that it was the recommendation of a faculty or of the university council. In the revised statutes, the trustees reserve the right to pass upon any exercise of the powers conferred on any faculty or the council, which involves a change in the educational policy of the University, but it is many years since this reserved power has been exercised.

"Some thirty years ago the trustees abolished the elaborate system

of committees which had long existed and substituted the very simple and effective system of three committees, and three only, to consider and report upon matters requiring the attention of the trustees which affect educational policies, the construction and maintenance of buildings, or the care of the endowments and investments of the corporation. These committees are, respectively, those on Education, on Buildings and Grounds, and on Finance; the five elected members of each committee are chosen for a five-year term and no trustee is eligible to succeed himself upon any one of these committees until at least one year has elapsed. Under this system a very considerable part of the membership of the trustees finds opportunity for service on one or more of these important committees, and thus comes in personal contact with the daily life and administration of the University.

"The president, with the assistance and cooperation of the officers of educational administration, prepares and presents business to the Committee on Education. Being directly charged by the statutes with the care of the university generally, of its buildings, of its grounds adjacent thereto, and of its movable property upon the same, the President, with the assistance and cooperation of the Director of Works and the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, prepares and presents business to the Committee on Buildings and Grounds...

"Trustees meet monthly, from October to May; eleven members constitute a quorum. The administrative and legislative work of the year centers about the budget which is adopted at the meeting in April, to become effective on July 1 following, and which controls the expenditures in general and in detail authorized for the following academic and fiscal year. The assembling of material for consideration in connection with the budget begins in the month of December, and every administrative officer and head of department is called upon for recommendations and criticisms. These preliminary estimates and requests are then passed upon by the Advisory Committee on Educational Policy which the Committee on Education brought into existence some years ago in order to lighten its own increasingly heavy labors. This committee consists of the president and the secretary of the university and various deans and directors named by the Committee on Education. The report of this Advisory Committee is ordinarily ready by the middle of January, and it is considered in one or more evening sessions by the Committee on

Education, usually in conference with some or all of the members of the Advisory Committee. The Committee on Education endeavor to make their budget report at the February meeting of the trustees or, at the latest, at the March meeting. . .

"The University Council is the outward and visible sign of that administrative unification of the university which was the cornerstone of the reconstruction that began with the revised statutes of 1890. Before that time the president and the trustees were the sole symbols of community of interest, if such there were, between Columbia College, the School of Mines, the School of Law, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, and the School of Political Science. In 1888 the trustees appointed a special committee, the purpose of which was to consider the feasibility and expediency of bringing about a true university organization under the authority of the trustees. The various faculties, as well as individual professors, were called upon for expressions of opinion, and among these was the suggestion that each faculty of the university should elect two or three representatives who, together with the president, should constitute a University Council. The purpose of this council was defined to be the control of non-professional university degrees and the consideration of all educational matters except those having to do with the first degree. This meant that Columbia College and the degree of bachelor of arts were to remain outside the jurisdiction of the proposed council. There was much opposition to this proposal as carrying with it a possible limitation of the authority or autonomy of the several faculties; but as a result of two years of study and discussion the council was constituted in 1890, but only as an advisory body without definite powers. It was therefore, to all intents and purposes, not a university council but a president's council, because it could only be the president that such a council might advise. This anomalous and obviously impossible situation came to a natural end in two years' time, and in June, 1892, the trustees so amended the statutes as to give the University Council certain definite legislative and administrative powers which are substantially those that it now possesses. So far as non-professional faculties are concerned, the council is, to all intents and purposes, a senate or upper legislative chamber. As regards the other faculties, it is a body with large, if somewhat undefined powers, especially in regard to anything that may relate to general university policy or to co-operation or conflict between the work of two or more faculties. . .

"The University Council as now constituted consists of the president, the dean of the faculties of political science, philosophy, and pure science, of Columbia College, of applied science, of law, of medicine, of Barnard College, of Teachers College, and of the College of Pharmacy, and the directors of the School of Journalism, of Architecture, of the summer session, of the university extension, of the School of Business, of the University Admissions, of the School of Dental and Oral Surgery, and of the School of Library Service, together with three elected members of the faculties of political science, philosophy, and pure science, two elected members of the faculties of Columbia College, Law, Medicine, Applied Science, Barnard College, Education, Practical Arts, and one elected member of the faculty of Pharmacy. The University Council meets statedly on the afternoon of the third Tuesday of October, December, February, and April. It has large powers of initiative; it may submit such proposals to the president, to the trustees, or to the several faculties, as in its judgment may serve to increase the efficiency of university work. It may consider any question that arises as to the conduct or efficiency of any officer of administration or instruction, and may report thereon to the trustees through the president; it fixes, or concurs with the proper faculties in fixing, the conditions upon which the several degrees of doctor and master shall be conferred in course; it has authority to adopt regulations governing the relation of the work of the summer sessions and of university extension to the other work of the university. It is called upon to encourage original research, to secure correlation of courses by the several faculties and administrative boards, and to decide all questions involving more than one faculty or administrative board...

"The several faculties and administrative boards are the originating legislative bodies in the university in respect to everything that has to do with educational policy, except only as to such matters as are specifically committed to the original jurisdiction of the University Council.

"The faculties and administrative boards have full jurisdiction over that part of the university's educational work which is committed to their care. They make all appointments to such posts on the teaching staff below the grade of assistant professor as may be provided for in the annual budget. They, or representative committees chosen by them, participate in all recommendations for appointment to the grades of assistant professor and beyond, such

recommendations taking their origin in the department or group most immediately concerned.

"With the growth of the university, the faculty membership has tended to become very large and the modes of transacting faculty business have been slowly but markedly altered in consequence. The faculty of Columbia College now consists of 79 members; Applied Science of 57; Medicine of 40; Political Science of 40; Philosophy of 58; Pure Science of 66; Law of 18; Barnard College of 54; Education of 79; and Practical Arts of 45. The effect of this increased membership has been to make the main business of these faculties that of electing representatives on a small committee of administration, which then acts for the faculty in all but the most important matters, subject, of course, to faculty revision and control. The faculties meet much less frequently than was formerly the case and the business transacted by them is in large part routine in character. Opinion is formed and action initiated at informal conferences from time to time, as well as by the various administrative committees which the faculties have constituted. One fortunate result of this development is to release a largely increased number of scholars from the more or less perfunctory duty of attendance on formal meetings, from committee service and from participation in administrative detail, which are often found so irksome. Where there is so much routine business to be done, it is expedient to have as much of it as possible done by purely administrative officers, leaving to the faculties and administrative boards the task of fixing policies and defining purposes...

"The reader who permits himself to be more than diverted by the clamorous criticisms of American universities that are thrust upon his attention from time to time will doubtless be mystified by their contradictory and self-destructing character. He reads, on the one hand, that these universities are hotbeds of radicalism, of revolution, and of all that is signified by the mystic word Bolshevism. Doctrines destructive of morality, of religion, and of public order are taught within their walls, and the influence of this teaching upon the public mind is revolutionary and pernicious in the extreme. Insistent demand is made that such teachers, however learned and successful, be silenced by fiat or turned loose to do their destructive work as individual disturbers of morality and the public peace, without the advantage of university association and university



authority. If then the page be turned, the reader finds himself asked to believe that these self-same universities are the entrenched strongholds of privilege, of reaction, and of capitalism, whatever that may mean. They are managed by capitalist trustees and subservient presidents whose minds are fixed on cultivating with servility and subservience all possible sources of benefaction. An ardent exponent of this point of view not long ago contributed to an English weekly publication an article on the American university, appropriately enough unsigned, in which he asked with heated passion these two questions: Is it any wonder that, at least openly, not a single professor of economics in America is a Socialist? Is it a matter for remark that no work of importance in political science has come from an American university these fifty years? Having thus established by the simple process of interrogation two facts which are rather more astounding than true, the anonymous writer then goes on to mention the names of six English men of letters, all of whom would be pretty certain of dismissal from their posts were they on the staff of an American university. It so happens that each one of the six has lately been invited to teach or lecture at an American university and that three of them accepted the invitation, with every appearance of physical and intellectual security. Five other Englishmen are named as those whom students would not be allowed to invite to address them. Three of the five have been so invited and have accepted and the remaining two have been invited in vain. . .

"The simple truth is that both of these extreme and wholly unjustified forms of criticism converge on the conclusion that the American university has increasingly tended to become a genuine university, a home of intellectual liberty and freedom of the spirit, and that of course it gives hearing to doctrines and opinions held by sincere and scholarly seekers after truth which are by no means universally accepted and which may indeed excite more or less violent opposition. In the church such exhibitions of freedom of thought would lead to expulsion; in the state they invite political attack, and if possible personal humiliation and suffering and loss. The university remains the only present home of liberty and apparently its only hope. If the voice of liberty be silenced there and the intolerance that now prevails in church and in state be permitted to invade the precincts of the universities of the world, then indeed must we be prepared to enter upon a new and dismal Dark Age that will cast the thoughts and the activities of man in common and uni-

form moulds, there to remain until such time as the unquenchable thirst for liberty shall again effectively manifest itself among men."

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

HARVARD, PRESIDENT LOWELL'S REPORT FOR 1925-26.—  
 "The problem is in fact worrying the authorities of colleges of every kind in America, and it is one that we have been striving to solve. Perhaps it is especially formidable in the case of a distinctively cultural college because it is hard to infuse into the undergraduates a sense of the vital importance of study leading, so far as they can see, to no immediate tangible results. The imponderables are the most valuable, but the least visible, of things. Inducements of every available kind must be used, but it is also needful to have a system that will tend to promote the object sought. The system adopted here has been that of a general final examination covering the whole of a subject which the student selects at the close of his freshman year, and a tutor to assist and stimulate him in making the subject his own by attaining a mastery thereof...

"Perhaps a better indication of the effect of the new system may be found in the percentage of men who have actually attained distinction at graduation:

Total Number Degrees Awarded, Omitting War Year	Degrees	Total Degrees with Distinction		Number of Degrees with Distinction in Special Subjects	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1922	547	114	20.8	82	15.0
1923	581	139	23.9	111	18.9
1924	584	171	29.3	120	20.5
1925	637	177	27.9	139	21.4
1926	648	184	28.4	143	22.1

"A technical critic might say that what we have done is little more than to adapt to undergraduate instruction the principles and methods long in use for men working for a doctorate of philosophy in graduate schools. To a great extent that is true, and it is not a criticism but a commendation; and in fact some of the theses by undergraduate candidates for distinction have been in quality, if not in extent, worthy of the doctorate. The fact is that, after the period of transition from high school is accomplished, college instruction ought to be conducted by university methods. The student should acquire as soon as possible the capacity for self-education under guidance, which is the essence of all training in the art of thought, and the foundation of the later education that continues

through life. No doubt the transfer of graduate methods to college will involve changes in the graduate schools also, and it is wholly to be desired. In America we have been teaching in college what ought to be taught, and by methods that ought to be finished, in the secondary school; and we have been using in the graduate school methods that should not be carried beyond the college. It is partly for this reason that the American college youth, as a class, has customs, immature modes of thought, an attitude towards its diversions, and lack of a sense of responsibility for its own education that belong to school-boys. Here, at least, this is less true of the undergraduates of the present day than of those of the past, as may be seen by the attitude of our students compared with that of alumni. The problem is one on which all colleges are working, and our contribution thereto—and one in which we have reason to feel encouraged—is the general examination and tutorial system. . . .

“Since intercollegiate athletics must now be under the control of the authorities of the university or college, is it not well that we should consider what their real object and utility are? Surely, as the aim in instruction is to give education to all, that in athletics should be the physical culture of all. To devote attention almost wholly to intercollegiate teams is no more justified than to devote attention almost exclusively to high scholars with comparatively little care for the rest of the student body; and indeed, it is less justified, because the high scholars are often being prepared for a life of scholarship, but the members of the teams are not being prepared for the career of professional athletes. As the object of teaching is to develop the intellectual qualities of every mind to the fullest possible extent, so the object of athletics is the greatest physical development of all; and if that be the object, athletic exercise should be encouraged and opportunities therefor provided for all. Now intercollegiate contests are a vital element in maintaining athletic interest, for what men admire, that they do; but like other things, these contests are a means to an end, which tend in the popular mind to become an end in themselves. The true end lies in promoting physical development and well-being throughout the student body. For this purpose intramural contests should be promoted, to give healthy exercise under the stimulus of competition to as many men as possible, and therefore Mr. William J. Bingham, who holds the newly created office of Director of Athletics, has added to the class teams other games between dormitories.

"The present method of conducting football games certainly calls out a considerable number of competitors for the squad, but it has serious defects. It tends to confine attention to the team, which plays a match with another college every Saturday from early in October until Thanksgiving. Formerly we played a second string of men against the smaller colleges, but this was not regarded by them as courteous, and their teams have improved so much as to call forth our best efforts. In fact, even a college with a small number of undergraduates which strives to recruit the best athletes from the schools, and hires the best coach to train them, stands a good chance of beating a great university that does not regard the winning of football victories as the prime object in higher education, and therefore does not resort to the same methods. Having great intercollegiate games every Saturday throughout the autumn in a stadium filled with many thousand spectators is not well either for members of the team or for the student body. It tends to disturb seriously the work of education, and still more to distort in the minds of the public and of the alumni the real object of the college. Intercollegiate games should be played, in so far as they promote the objects for which the college exists, not in order to maintain a form of sport. They should be conducted for the benefit of the students, by them and by the appropriate authorities of the university, not by others to furnish entertainment to alumni and the public. With these ideas in mind, the Director of Athletics has desired to reduce the excessive prominence of the games which precede the great final contest with Yale that closes the season; and supported unanimously by the Committee on Athletics, he decided to do so by not playing continuously, year after year, with any other college. This is the first attempt to grapple with a problem generally felt to be very serious by the people responsible for the welfare of American colleges. It is a courageous move, because it is certain to encounter opposition; but it is one that deserves the support of all men who appreciate the duty that colleges owe to the progress of higher education in this country."

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL.

PITTSBURGH: REPORT OF THE CHANCELLOR TO THE TRUSTEES.—  
"One explanation of student incompetence is the curriculum. It needs attack. We can reasonably expect to affect student work by changing the substance of what is taught.

"Following an argument years ago about the value of laboratory sciences, the elective system was brought into use. This system opened the way for various vocational and semi-professional courses to find their beginnings in the liberal arts curriculum. Among the liberal arts, for example, courses are offered in textile designing, cabinet work, landscape gardening, psychology of advertising, type-writing, and dancing. We may grant that all of these subjects have social value, but that is not the point. The question is whether or not these new-type subjects threaten the older purposes of the college without giving compensating values. We were sane enough when we adopted the elective system. We need now fresh care to determine wisely how much liberal and how much technical work may make up a four-year course of liberal arts.

"The weakening of liberal study in the college would seem to be a loss to American life, for liberal arts have long been at the bottom of our hope in education. Liberal arts form that part of education which tries to build out the character and to increase the intellectual vigor of each student. Liberal arts relate to the person rather than to the person's profession, or to his equipment for economic competition. If we need men of character and of culture, we need the liberal studies; and one certain part of our problem at the University is right understanding of these studies and of their placement in the curriculum.

"Two other elements of the curriculum need consideration: standardization and research. For a time standardization was fashionable. We accepted it; and now we are acutely aware of its shortcomings. We devised courses neatly articulated, and copied methods and curricula, all in a vague hope of creating standardized types of graduates. But the need is to make students think rather than to be alike, and that is not a machine job. Research, the latter phase, has its flaws, too. We have long praised its virtues. Our learning would be feeble without them. Yet we should not forget that there is a dimension of breadth as well as depth to education; we should have courses designed for students as well as for scholars; and we should realize that over-specialization is an injustice to young men and women who need an understanding of the wide scope of knowledge even more than they need the facts and the discipline which spring from the pursuit of an isolated theme. Both standardization and research are true parts of a curriculum, for they are concerned with the substance of what is taught.



"Another obstacle to good teaching has been the rapid growth of universities. We have doubled or trebled enrolments, sometimes in half a dozen years. This has caused a demand for teachers, probably greater than any epidemic ever caused for doctors. The result was an intake of the unfit. General incompetence of teachers is a more delicate subject than incompetence of students, and certainly a less popular one. In justice, though, we ought to meet the facts.

"Individual incompetence among teachers is a still more delicate subject, yet it exists. Although some lack scholarship, this defect is being overcome by the recent emphasis upon sound learning. Some lack experience, but this, too, will right itself. Much less easy to demand are those qualities of poise and of culture which good teaching requires. The aim of this section, however, is to point out problems rather than to seek their solutions; therefore we may observe that these qualities are too little in evidence. In America one can scarcely speak of culture in historic terms. Universities do not draw either students or teachers from a privileged class. Sons of uneducated parents become professors and deans. Yet it is quite apparent that we do have cultured individuals, and equally apparent that there are not enough of them in teaching positions.

"*More Good Teaching.*—Teaching is the primary active influence of the university. The others are inert. Whatever occurs to a student in the university, whatever happens there to help him grow, will be largely affected by the teacher. Buildings, however good and beautiful, and libraries and laboratories and curricula adjusted to all grades and temperaments—these are nothing unless we have good teaching. The strength of a university lies in the strength of its teachers. But let us go into the reasons.

"Dean Alderman, in studying this question secured from twenty-nine leading universities the data which they asked in seeking new teachers...

"The list, however, is not a fair summary of what a substantial university expects as technical essentials. On the whole, it is desired that a teacher has had some experience, that he has scholarly ability in his field, and that he has received one or two advanced degrees. But these are not all which should be included. There are qualities lodged in the personality and character which are even more important. These are qualities difficult to measure. Let us call them the teacher's immeasurable ability, or his personal fitness.

"In a word, the teacher should be a scholar, a gentleman, and, in

the old sense, 'a prophet, who reveals poetic truth, who opens the closed or half-closed windows of the mind.' Students remember best the prophet in their instructors.

"Largely as a result of individual unfitness, there have grown up some types of teaching which are bad. One is a sort of mechanical lecturing from notes—thin, hard streams of words, devoid of feeling, and untouched by the surging life to which the subject belongs. At the opposite extreme is the occasional instructor—very often a popular fellow—who makes each hour a vaudeville for his class, and sends his students away emotionally gratified and intellectually undisturbed. Still worse are the professors and the instructors of the puffed-up type. From their high positions they are sure that it is foolish to take teaching seriously. 'Why prepare for a lecture or a discussion? You can get along well enough. . . Didn't meet my early class this morning. . . too sleepy.' These are well-worn scraps of bragging. What can we expect of students so long as an instructor boasts of tricking his classes into mistakes, or of bluffing through questions on which he was not informed?

"There is nothing new about this immeasurable ability of the teacher. But the value of this ability needs new emphasis. In a more orderly way, now, let us summarize the qualities of a good teacher.

"Scholarship implies specialization, information, intellect, industry, imagination, and ability to organize and to analyze material. The scholar distinguishes between fact and guess-work. He teaches nothing that later cannot be built upon. These are splendid gifts, but the true scholar has more. If he is a biologist, he has more than an exclusive set of data, for example, about the eugenic significance of experiments with *drosophilla*; he has within himself a power which drives him on, a love for his subject and for other subjects. His feelings are caught, held, and carried up by learning.

"It is a little like saying that snow is white to say that a teacher should be human. Yet a certain dry, mechanical practice of instruction makes this statement not all amiss. Down at the bottom of this matter, to teach, to make students feel the thrill of new thought and new knowledge, is, first of all, respect for them, and belief in them. With the capable teacher always 'more is meant than meets the eye.' The more is fine humanity. Such a teacher respects the beliefs and opinions of others, whoever they may be. He willingly offends no one. He gives out kindness and imaginative delight and gets them back from others.

"Culture is a term to conjure with. Abused, elusive, indefinable, it stands as the most immeasurable quality of a teacher's usefulness. It implies the respect for others, just mentioned. It implies humanity, for no man lacking the warmth of humanity is cultured. If humanity is the clay out of which we are made, culture may be the unity of the lines and modelings. Two technical results spring from a teacher's culture: his ability to relate his subject to general learning, and his ability to relate his subject to common life. The cultured teacher sees clearly both himself and his field of study in relation to a vast store of knowledge; he sees both in relation to the habits, fashions, courage, squalor, reality, and beauty of the life in which students live. As he sees life widened out in this way, inevitably his students will see it too, provided only that his teaching is an expression of his own grasp of life and of knowledge.

"Always the teacher—scholar, man of humanity and of culture—is a creative artist. As an artist he is one who takes material and by skill and imagination makes a true, universal, and organic unity out of it. The poet takes words, rhyme, vowel-sound, and stanza-form, and with them he gives a just expression to a just impulse. The impulse may be a hope, a conviction, a revelation; a living sense of the best he has been able to find. Similarly, the teacher seeks to find a just expression of what he sees in the lives of students. The teacher is a creative artist; he seeks to create an organic unity which did not exist before in the lives of his students.

"This idea may be more clear if we quite get rid of the notion that a student's mind is a bottle, that a teacher is one put in charge of the barrel of knowledge, and that teaching is a process of pouring this knowledge into the bottle. It sometimes seems that methods and systems, much discussed these days, are responsible for the bottle-barrel theory; as though methods and systems, if good enough, could make the bottle hold more and stop evaporation and leakage.

"No, great teachers from Socrates, Jesus, and St. Francis, have looked on teaching as an art and as a creation. The scholar takes his material and with it forms in his students a new reality—new insight and hope which last to the end and make men strong.

"The point here is to emphasize the art-process in teaching as a university policy. Scholarship—that is taken for granted. We need it, a high quality of it. But we need also more than scholarship. We need teachers who by acts, words, and expressions cause simple every-day things within their own lives to radiate an invisible glory

because those simple every-day things are touched with spiritual beauty. This power to draw the real meaning from our surroundings cannot be measured or systematized. It is based upon sincerity; it depends upon *living ourselves* the life we would reveal.

"How can this immeasurable ability of the teacher be found? Are these qualities only in the possession of geniuses?

"The first question is difficult to answer. There can be no mechanical measure or test for the desired ability. We must rely upon experience. If we know what we want, we can look for it more than we have done. We can search in schools and colleges, and out of them. Since the ability is personal and immeasurable, our best gauge of it seems to be the judgment of men who have much of it and who can recognize it. We may make mistakes in that way, but there seems to be no better way.

"Are the qualities we seek found only in geniuses? No proof appears to this effect. With teaching, just as with commerce, manufacturing, music, and navigation, a demand arises, a search follows, and adequate men appear. Many men have the talents we seek in teachers; and, because nobody cares about those talents, they lie buried. The need, then, seems largely to be one of emphasis.

"To maintain a faculty which has personal teaching power is a large problem. Part of the solution, as just stated, lies in demanding that those who teach shall have this quality. But here a fallacy arises, for a teacher uses his power in a spontaneous and unconscious way. If, now, we give him a list of desirable traits, and urge that in his classroom he display them—that is, that he be human, and scholarly, and cultured, and creative—we shall not gain much. The teacher must, as a first requisite, be himself. In this connection we have, roughly, two groups of teachers to consider: the older ones, established in method and habit, and the group of more recent graduates. As to the latter, a struggle to meet a definite ideal will do good. The conscious effort in time becomes unconscious action. All of them we can ask in serious kindness to answer, from time to time, to themselves, these questions:

"What life values do I have to give from my learning, personality, and character?

"Do I find it possible through teaching to give these values?

"Do I honestly consider these values to help in my students' growth?

"In looking back, now, over the scope of this report and in taking

long thought over the decision to emphasize good teaching as the next forward policy of the University, that course seems wise. With excellent teaching throughout the University, it is hard to believe that there will be much left of the problems of students and of curricula. Especially does the elimination of incompetent students rest upon good teaching."

T. G. BOWMAN.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY: REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT. (For the Academic Year 1925-26.)—"With the close of the academic year just past we have completed three years of experience with our upper-class plan of study. We are reasonably justified in the opinion that we may regard the new course of study as having passed through its experimental stage, to the extent at least that we are confident that we are on the right way...

"We owe it to our freshmen and sophomores that in the training of their earlier years they should be gradually prepared for the new freedom and independent work of the two upper years.

"A large number of our students enter the University with a very high record behind them in their work, both in their school years and as a result of the board examinations. With the information available in the office of the Director of Admission we are able to know the members of the freshman class who have the capacity for high grade work in particular fields of study. We are giving these students an opportunity to elect sections in certain courses in which the instruction will be more of the nature of guidance in their studies than drill in details. The response has been very gratifying, with the result that there are two such sections in English, French, and Latin, and one in mathematics. In addition there is an advanced course in chemistry with two laboratory periods, whereas in the other freshman courses in chemistry there is only one such period. As far as possible the other divisions in the freshman courses are graded according to the ability of the students...

"The English department has revised its whole program of studies, with particular regard to the teaching of English in freshman and sophomore years.

"A new freshman course has been arranged, and is now in operation, which consists of a combination of the best features in the two courses formerly given for freshmen and sophomores. The new freshman course is conducted by means of one lecture and two



classroom exercises each week. It is designed to give to the entering student (a) an introduction to literary values, and to cultivate in him a taste for the best poetry and prose; (b) a view of the great development of English literature from the beginnings to the nineteenth century, and an acquaintance with certain of the major outstanding writers; (c) guidance and frequent practice in the simpler forms of composition. This course will serve as an introduction to all the later courses given by the department...

"In sophomore year we have endeavored to provide introductory courses given by the various departments so as to afford an opportunity to all the members of this class to know something of the general nature of the studies in the various departments. In fact we have now in sophomore year many courses of an introductory nature which formerly were in junior year. In the academic year 1926-27 there will be given for the first time by the department of art and archeology an introductory course in the history of art. All the departments of junior and senior year are represented through introductory courses in sophomore year, with the exception of the departments of politics and astronomy. The department of politics has offered no such introductory course in sophomore year because the members of the department are of the opinion that the best introduction to the studies of their department is to be found in the courses of history and economics in sophomore year. In a similar manner the best introduction to astronomy is regarded by the members of that department to be the courses in mathematics and physics.

"It is hoped and expected that with these introductory courses the members of the sophomore class will be prepared to choose their department of special study in junior and senior years along the line of their particular interest and aptitude.

"We have established a bureau of vocational counsel and of business and professional appointments and have called as the director Mr. Philip Brasher, of the Class of '06. While one of the director's functions is naturally to help our seniors to secure suitable positions after their graduation, we have another end in view—to bring the director in touch with the undergraduates in such a helpful manner that he may through his counsel help them to discover in their earlier years that field of study which will most interest them, and later in their university course prove of similar assistance in a final decision concerning their ultimate vocation. Mr. Brasher has had a wide experience in personnel work in many large corporations, and there-

fore is able to interpret the many signs, invisible to the ordinary observer, which however are revealed through the intimate contact of an older and experienced man with younger men.

"A number of critical comments have come to my attention concerning our upperclass plan of study. It is alleged, without a knowledge of the facts in the case, that we are setting tasks for our undergraduates which only graduate students are capable of doing; that we are endeavoring to turn out of Princeton a group of seniors who are of approved scholarly ability of exceptionally high order, and that the student of ordinary ability will soon become absolutely discouraged and eventually will fall by the way. This is neither a true nor a fair statement of our experience with the practical working of the upperclass plan of study...

"The fundamental principle upon which our method of study in junior and senior years rests is that we believe our students should be taught to think for themselves, not merely to remember what they are told in the classroom or in textbooks. To this end we place upon them responsibility of such a nature that it will stimulate their initiative. We feel that the most valuable possession which they can take away from Princeton as a result of their four years of study is the habit of seeking first-hand information for themselves, and of forming an independent judgment. If they are to be successful in business or in professional pursuits they must have ordered minds, alert, vigorous and discriminating. We are aiming above everything else to quicken the intellectual processes of our students, believing that when the mind is once quickened there comes to the individual a sense of power, a growing interest in his work, and a satisfaction which is the only true reward of any honest effort...

"With the demand for admission to the University increasing every year and the consequent limitation of enrolment, it is not fair to deny the privileges of the University to a group of students seeking admission, while at the same time providing a second opportunity for a group who have not availed themselves of their first chance. The question of serious illness, or an equally compelling cause, will always be most carefully considered; but our past policy of allowing students to return to Princeton, who have made a fair record at other colleges or universities, is no longer possible. Several institutions have made formal and serious objections to such a policy, protesting that it is not fair to have Princeton students, who have failed, come to them for a term and then go back to Princeton...

"It was found by the study of the Committee that students who have failed three courses in either term of freshman year were almost invariably dropped from the University subsequently, or having lost their class standing, constituted a large part of the group of those who are in constant academic difficulties. Accordingly it has been decided that a freshman who fails in three or more courses in either term, or in four courses during the year, will be dropped from the University...

*"Reduction of Courses.*—We have provided for a reduction in the number of courses required of a senior of high scholarly attainment who wishes to devote additional time to investigation of a subject in his field of study. This is a natural step in the development of our academic program. The recommendation was adopted by the Faculty at its meeting on February 15, 1926, and is as follows:

"That when, in the opinion of a department, one of its seniors has given evidence of high scholarly attainment in his independent work, and additional time is necessary for the execution of his investigation, the department may request, in such exceptional cases, that he be relieved of one of his courses; the request and the reason for it shall be presented in writing to the Committee on the Course of Study; and the Committee shall have power to grant such a reduction.' "

JOHN GRIER HIBBEN,

Princeton University, *The Official Register*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1.

## EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

HIGHER EDUCATION.<sup>1</sup>—"The most important element in accounting for the increase is the growth in teachers' salaries. This increase during the years of the World War and immediately thereafter has been one of the most remarkable phenomena in higher education in the United States. In small colleges salaries rose from an average of about \$1400 to an average of \$2000, in medium-sized institutions from \$2500 to \$4000, and in the large institutions from \$5000 to \$8000 or \$10,000. During the same period the number of students more than doubled. In 1912 there were 255,673 students enrolled in the colleges and universities; by 1922 the number had become 550,906. Obviously, however, doubling the number of students does not fully account for the fact that expenditure trebled. Other factors contributed to increased cost.

"Research, always an expensive feature of university expenditures, became in all fields increasingly a concern of higher educational institutions. Every university of any pretensions came to base its claims for honor and reputation largely upon extensive programs of graduate research. Undergraduate courses at the same time multiplied and were enriched by the addition of a great variety of offerings which formerly had not been regarded as essential parts of an undergraduate course. Technical courses were added, professional courses stiffened, and work with direct pre-professional purposes emphasized. More students, more research, more varied courses, mean more teachers (an increase in staff from 30,034 in 1912 to 49,838 in 1922); more buildings, including dormitories, laboratories, and classrooms; more equipment; in other words, more money. While this educational development was going on, money lost value, or in other words price levels increased. . .

"*Selective Processes.*—Partly as a result of increased costs and partly as a result of increased interest in testing and grading programs developed from Army psychological testing, colleges have during the biennium attempted to meet the problem of the great influx of students by more careful selective processes, both for admission and for passage through the work of the college. These processes range all the way from direct limitation of numbers to attempts to score the individual characteristics of students with reference to the bearing of these characteristics upon suitability for

<sup>1</sup> Biennial Survey 1922-24, Bureau of Education, Washington.

college education. The most important methods may be grouped under seven heads: First, arbitrary limitation of the number admitted; second, increased fees; third, use of the entrance examination; fourth, enforcement of high standards for entrance and institutional accrediting; fifth, grade limitations, both for admission and for progress; sixth, scoring of personal characteristics; and seventh, psychological testing...

*"Student Fees.*—An obvious device which it was thought might limit the number of applicants for college entrance and the number of those who persist through a college course, was increase of student fees. This proposal was in line with the criticism of higher education that it was too free and that students should pay a larger proportion of the expense of their education. A study of the fees charged, made by the Bureau of Education for the year 1923-24, shows, when compared with fees listed in the catalogues of preceding years, that many institutions have thus increased the financial load of the student during the biennium. However, reduction in the number of students has not resulted. Michigan increased the fees in its medical courses, but this had little effect upon the number applying for admission. The University of Illinois also increased its fees to non-residents of the state, but again this had little effect in reducing the number of applicants. In general, increase of fees, therefore, has the effect of increasing the income of the institution but little effect upon discouraging attendance. Such increase of income as is derived from increase of fees does not necessarily mean greater economy. If the number of students admitted increases, costs may increase more rapidly than fee income, since in no case has an institution attempted to raise its fees to the point where the student pays the entire cost of his education. No one has as yet determined a fee charge which will actually hold applications for admission to any specific number for a given institution.

*"Entrance Examinations.*—Although some institutions, notably those in New England, continue to maintain a direct control over the number of entrants each year by means of the entrance examination conducted by the institution itself, there seems to be little tendency to take further advantage of this device... However, it is probable that in the near future institutions which now maintain their position in the college world only upon the basis that they conform to the standards of accrediting associations may wish to develop educational service of distinctive character. They may find the



entrance examination one means of insuring entrants who will be suited to the peculiar character which they wish to impress upon the institution.

*"Standards of Admission and of Institutional Accrediting.*—The work of the regional and national accrediting associations tends to bring about uniformity between institutions. During the biennium the influence and importance of the regional associations have developed to a remarkable degree. The North Central Association and the Southern Association now exercise more powerful influences upon secondary education and upon the standardization of colleges themselves than do any other national forces. In this connection a resolution of the North Central Association, adopted in 1923 and supported by the higher educational representatives in the association, recommends that the colleges should provide an alternative system of entrance by which students who have completed 11 or 12 units in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades of the senior high school may be admitted with full standing. If this resolution is accepted by the member institutions, it will have an important effect upon the development of the junior-senior high school system and tend to reduce the number of applicants for college entrance who are unfit, by providing in these high schools completion courses not looking to college entrance. Similar effects in relieving the college burden may be expected from the growth of the junior college idea.

"The tendency toward uniformity has been promoted by the adoption by the American Council on Education of standards for colleges, junior colleges, and teacher-training institutions, the two latter during the biennium. These standards were published with the recommendation that the regional and other accrediting agencies adopt them as a basis for accrediting institutions within their special fields of influence. Practically all of the regional associations have followed this suggestion and adopted the American Council's standards or modified them somewhat to meet local necessities. The Association of American Universities, which had previously operated under the standards of the American Council has been given a grant by the Carnegie Foundation to enable it to conduct examinations of institutions for purposes of accrediting. The Catholic Education Association has accepted the standards of the American Council on Education, and other denominational educational organizations have been considering similar or other action looking to betterment of standards in church schools under their control or influence...

"Paralleling the development of more exact standards for admission to college and for admission to the list of institutions which may properly be defined as higher educational institutions is the development in the standards for professional work. The American Bar Association adopted standards in 1921; and in 1923, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, and the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties also established standards for their specific work...

*"Character Scoring.*—It seems to have been established by various investigations, notably at the University of Minnesota, that failures on the part of freshmen are not due so much to lack of ability as to lack of personal qualities and characteristics which enable the student to adjust himself to the environment and work of the college. Increased emphasis has been placed, therefore, upon admission to college upon the basis of personal qualities, including the physical. Scoring of applicants for college entrance upon the basis of personal characteristics attempts to cover good habits, industry, manners, respect for law, perseverance, alertness, competence, vigor, promptness, accuracy, participation in activities, and financial condition...

"In addition to the service which character scoring renders in securing students who are fitted for good college work, the results of such personal knowledge of students should aid the institution in rendering careful instructional service. In the past the professors under whom students took their work knew little about the high-school records of their students, nothing in most cases about the parents and home conditions from which the students came, and only so much of their mental abilities and tendencies of character as they might derive from classroom contact. The personal history and estimate of students, if made available to the instructing staff, should contribute to improved college teaching procedure.

*"Psychological Tests.*—Enthusiasts about the possibilities of psychological tests frequently have urged that the psychological test be used as a basis of admission to college. So far development in this line seems to be insignificant. One investigation, made by the north central association in 1924, shows that institutions within its territory were not using mental testing for admission to any great extent. The service of psychological testing, in so far as it has been accepted, apparently lies in other directions, presented in another portion of this discussion...

*"Freshmen Problems.*—In the University of Wisconsin by Feb-

ruary, 1923, 11 per cent of the class entering in the preceding fall had dropped out; in February, 1924, the corresponding figure for the class which entered in the fall of 1923 was 13 per cent. In Harvard only 76 per cent of the freshmen who registered in September, 1923, were promoted in good standing at the end of the freshman year. Lack of ability is the least important factor in accounting for such losses; over-enthusiasm for sports and other extra-curricular activities is perhaps the most frequent cause. Leaving the freshman almost entirely to his own devices in making his entrance into the official and social life of the institution results in homesickness and discouragement or in useless efforts and dependence upon chance influences. Naturally his fellow freshmen and older students give him a one-sided conception of college life, a picture made up largely of athletics, social life, and extra-curricular employments. The college authorities, the faculty, and study, under such conditions, contend upon unequal terms with 'activities' in presenting their claims to his time and attention. He has little direct personal contact with college officials and official purposes, and that little is under what he and his fellows regard as compulsion.

"Several institutions, following the lead of the University of Maine, the University of Rochester, and the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, which are pioneers in the movement, have adopted the device known as 'freshman week' in order to deal systematically with the condition described... The purpose is to acquaint the new student with the aims, opportunities, and customs of the institution and to secure information, by means of psychological or other tests, which will aid in more careful personal educational service during the freshman year and thereafter. The plan is so simple, results obtained so excellent, and the possibilities for further development so obvious that general adoption of the device of freshman week may be looked for among institutions which are seriously trying to meet their educational and social problems.

"*Sectioning Classes.*—Freshman week affords an opportunity for obtaining information which will enable the institution to group students according to their abilities, as revealed by previous academic records or by special tests. The plan of sectioning classes in this way is developing rather rapidly. Eleven institutions, in addition to two now following the plan, intend to inaugurate such sectioning in the near future. The chief hindrances in the way of satisfactory sectioning are the desire of students for specific instructors and

schedule difficulties which prevent free passage from one section to another in accordance with the record made by the student in his college work...

*"Orientation Courses.*—Just as freshman week is intended to orient the student in his new administrative and social environment, the orientation course is intended to orient him in the fields of knowledge which are spread before him in the college curricula. The orientation course is intended to unify the material of the curriculum; to constitute what may be called following the terminology of vocational education, a pre-educational course. More specifically, it is intended to train the student to think and to introduce him to a general survey of the nature of the world and of man.

*"Teaching Methods.*—Colleges have been as yet little affected by the development of educational theory already commonly applied to instruction in the elementary and secondary schools. At first sight it would seem difficult to account for this fact since these theories have been developed in large part by the schools and colleges of education in the universities. Familiarity with these theories, however, seems to be confined to the professors of education. As a matter of fact, the college-teaching profession does not rank teaching with research. College teachers and college administrators, although both would repudiate the attitude, tend to undervalue the man who is more greatly concerned about his teaching problems than about his administrative or research work...

"No doubt there is a methodology of college teaching. At any rate there is a considerable body of knowledge in regard to the technique of teaching which is not shared or practiced to any great extent by college professors. Graduate students qualify for college teaching positions upon the basis of research which is only in the slightest degree related to ability to instruct. In fact research work of the type which places students upon the list of eligibles for college employment is frequently of such nature that it unfits for teaching...

"Aside from the development of the sabbatical furlough for college professors, which has a somewhat attenuated connection with improvement in college teaching, little positive action has been taken to make college professors better college teachers. It is true that college administrators are pleased when they obtain a good teacher, but they have few means of judging the nature of teaching in their institutions<sup>7</sup> and even less satisfactory standards for determining the teaching ability of new men whom they employ.

In this connection protest has been made quite frequently during the biennium that as soon as an institution gets a professor who establishes a reputation for good teaching or leadership in research, he is hired away by some other college...

*"Special Honors and Distinctions.*—There is a growing tendency to adopt some plan of providing special recognition and distinction for the man who attains a certain ranking throughout his college course and for the man who does extra work. These plans follow in general the old principle of granting the degree *cum laude* or *magna cum laude*. One of the most popular recent devices of this kind is based upon what is known as the *point system*. The plan as adopted at the University of Michigan provides that for each 'A' grade three points shall be counted; for each 'B' grade two points; 'C' grade, one point; 'D' grade, no point; and 'E' grade, a minus point. For graduation the same number of points as of credits or hours is required. The man whose general average in points is 2.15 or 2.5 is regarded as having attained distinction or high distinction, and his name is frequently put in the catalog or commencement program under these headings...

*'Honors Courses.*—Limiting enrolment, selective processes intended to secure students who will profit from training, special orientation courses for freshmen, and maintenance of high course averages all fail to provide adequately for the specially gifted student. They all fail to encourage independent initiative and self-directed work to the point where the scholarly attitude or the power of independent procedure in dealing with new problems is developed. The need is for some method which will induce every student, and especially the gifted ones, to extend themselves to the limit of their abilities. The old methods and courses failed to do this. The commission on faculty and student scholarship of the Association of American Colleges in 1923 reported that, of all the attempts to accomplish these purposes, the honors courses developed in this country by Swarthmore is the best and most promising. Honors courses as developed by Swarthmore and adopted by other institutions, notably Barnard, Carleton, and Smith, are based in fact upon the influence of the English honors courses made familiar to this country through the Rhodes scholarships, Canadian practice, and by closer international student relations...

"No single movement in higher education has been given more interest or promises more far-reaching results than this. The



course as developed implies independent study on the part of students, less formal relationships with the faculty, and relaxation of attendance upon classes and ordinary class examinations. . .

*"Graduate Work.*—The United States has developed a large number of great universities which are famous for their research work. Through a somewhat curious misapprehension of educational purposes, research and greatness have therefore become somewhat confused. Research no doubt is an important means of testing the standing and reputation of a university, but this basis of judgment is carried to an extreme point when it leads practically every university in the United States to base its claims to recognition upon extensive and varied programs of graduate research work. The fact that eligibility for college employment depends so largely upon research has contributed to this attitude. The results have not been entirely happy.

"During and following the World War the demand for college instructors exceeded the supply. Colleges still demanded, however, that their instructors hold higher degrees. As a result, pressure upon graduate institutions to meet this demand aided in the promotion of the already existing tendency to carry over into graduate research work the prevailing undergraduate conception that education consists of completion of courses and compilation of units. It is asserted quite frequently that graduate work is now on the basis of what the graduate student is admitted from and not upon the basis of what he is admitted to. In other words, research is in some of our graduate departments defined largely in terms of undergraduate college education. As someone has expressed it, present graduate work 'coddles immaturity.'

"Two proposals have been made recently looking to improvement of the situation with reference to graduate work: First, that institutions specialize in the kind of graduate work to which they devote their resources, thus insuring, in so far as educational expenditures serve to direct research activity, concentration of energy and ability upon limited fields. Beyond question money alone, even money combined with the assembly of large bodies of graduate students, does not provide all the conditions necessary for successful prosecution of highly specialized research. It is thought, however, that specialization as between institutions will attract to each institution leaders of research who will find in the combination of their work and efforts and in the special facilities provided a happy ground for work

of the highest type. A second suggestion made, which is in no way contradictory to the first, is that a greater degree of cooperative research work as between higher institutions be developed. Several examples of such cooperative research during the period are of special note. The Modern Language Association Research, for instance, in which thirty-five research groups are cooperating, is pointed to as a conclusive argument for such procedure.

*"Social and College Life.*—Much discussion of the work of the colleges and universities of the United States is centered about the activities which are not directly under the control of the college authorities and arises from discontent with the institutional efforts to give the individual student proper living guidance at those times when he is not in the classroom... The institutions have felt an increasing need to take positive action looking to personal advice and guidance for students in their numerous academic, social, and financial relations. The feeling has developed that the housing, health, and morals of students are matters to which administrative authority may properly devote more attention. The question is raised whether even the activities directed by students themselves may not be brought into closer relationship with the institutional and educational aims of the college. The charge that the higher institution is an isolated island in the midst of the activities of the world has led to increasing interest in the establishment of outside contacts...

"Athletics present troublesome problems to the college administrator who is interested in the well-being of his students, and have caused much comment and concern outside college walls. The athletic situation is greatly complicated by the fact that athletics have become a matter of large money transactions... The size of these operations has emphasized the need of mature control of financial matters. Young boys, even young men who are supposed to be receiving a college education, should not be called upon to transact business of such magnitude. The effect upon athletics is to make public spectacles of intercollegiate contests, even though it is true that the tickets for the big games are taken largely by alumni and students. The tendency is to carry on contests with institutions that result in the large gate receipts and to develop coaches and teams who will be winners.

"Abolition of professional college coaches and substitution of faculty coaches in their place has received great impetus from its

approval by representatives of twelve New York and New England colleges in 1922.

"The contention that it is impossible for the college to develop intramural sports in those lines which are carried on in intercollegiate athletics has been disproved conclusively. At Princeton, to take but one instance, 1215 of its 2000 students were in 1924 members of intercollegiate sports squads. Careful supervision and determined efforts to bring about an athletic situation which would really contribute to the physical and moral welfare of the students account for such development. The Universities of Illinois, North Carolina, Ohio State, and Ohio Wesleyan also report a great growth in intramural sports.

*"Outside Contacts.*—More extensive and closer contact between the higher educational institutions and the outside world is intimately bound up with two matters which have given trouble to college authorities—freedom of speech and academic freedom. The former concerns the freedom with which college buildings and property may be used by student organizations and others for presenting ideas and facts which are the subject of discussion outside college walls. No general rule which will eliminate the necessity for discretion has been devised. In general, addresses of a scholarly nature or those of general interest are permitted and encouraged. Advocacy of destruction of the Government by violence or unlawful means or attack upon the accepted code of morals are forbidden. What constitutes an accepted code of morals, is, of course, a matter of opinion. Critics of educational institutions contend that when revision of conventional moral standards is in progress, institutions permit the greatest freedom to those who defend the conservative viewpoint, while those who are working for change are forbidden to present their ideas to students. Similar differences of opinion arise in connection with political campaigns. No institution would forbid a general discussion of political issues; many will forbid the use of college or university buildings for presentation of the claims of a political candidate even though such discussions and claims are presented freely in the newspapers and across the street from the campus. No doubt an institution has a legal right and a moral obligation to control the outside influences which are brought to bear upon its students; its standards of control should be publicly known and impartially applied.

"The matter, however, of participation of the college staff in out-

side discussions, either in the classroom or in public, presents somewhat greater difficulties. A committee of the Association of American Colleges in 1922 formulated general principles in regard to this matter which after a year's discussion were adopted in 1923. These principles deal with four points. First, they recognize that freedom of research should be maintained unless restriction is necessary in the interest of teaching. Second, the college should not place restriction upon freedom in presentation of the teacher's own subject in the classroom, in outside addresses, or in publications except such as are agreed upon in advance or such as are necessary for immature students. Third, they recognized the right and the duty of the institution to restrict discussion of outside matters in the classroom which is supposed to be devoted to instruction of a special kind. Fourth, that the teacher's right of public discussion of questions outside his own field is the same as that of anyone else, except that the teacher must always make it clear that he and not the institution is responsible for the views expressed."

ARTHUR J. KLEIN in *Bulletin* No. 20, 1926, Bureau of Education.

REPORT OF PROGRESS IN A STUDY OF SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ATHLETICS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.<sup>1</sup>—In January, 1926, the Executive Committee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching authorized, at your request, a study of school, college, and university athletics in the United States and Canada.

Realizing from the beginning that the inquiry, to have value, must enlist the friendliest cooperation of as many qualified men and women as possible, we first asked about one hundred and twenty-five selected persons concerned with sport or with education to suggest what seemed to them most to require study. Their replies, to the number of nearly one hundred, yielded more than one hundred and fifty topics of inquiry, both broad and restricted, and a great many suggestions as to method.

On assembling and digesting this material we formulated a series of provisional principles which may be stated as follows:

(1) In this inquiry facts are of more importance than opinions, except perhaps when opinion itself becomes fact. Our best efforts

<sup>1</sup> National Collegiate Athletic Association, Hotel Astor, December 30, 1926, by Howard J. Savage, Staff Member of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Those concerned with the study will be pleased to have such facts, whether confidential or not, regarding athletics in American schools, colleges, and universities, as members of the American Association of University Professors desire to give by letter or in person. Communications should be addressed to Howard J. Savage, Room 1014, 522 Fifth Ave., New York City.

therefore must be bent first to accumulate the facts and then to test opinion by them.

(2) Any description of conditions or recommendations that result from the inquiry must be grounded in fact, must be as unprejudiced as it is possible to make them, and must take into consideration both the past and the present as well as the future.

(3) No opinion concerning any phase of the inquiry, however important or unimportant it may seem at the moment, can be safely formed until all the material has been collected and studied.

(4) The special staff for the inquiry must be kept at all times in intimate relation to the work for the sake of maintaining a balanced and unified view. As much of the data as possible must be collected by personal visits to institutions by members of the special staff, and as little as possible by questionnaire.

(5) Advice, assistance, and cooperation must be sought from every person suggested as qualified to give them.

Thus far experience has confirmed us in these five preliminary judgments.

It early became apparent that certain material already in the hands of the Foundation has bearing upon the present inquiry. In 1923 there had been collected from some twenty colleges and universities data concerning athletics, which had been carefully studied for another purpose. Although the results of this inquiry were published in the Twentieth Annual Report of the Foundation it is felt that the data have value in both past and present relationships. Perhaps even more important were the experience gained and information collected through personal visits in England and Scotland during some months of 1925, soon to appear as Bulletin Eighteen of the Foundation,<sup>1</sup> entitled "Games and Sports in British Schools and Universities." Although this was undertaken before the present study was conceived, it now seems likely to form, without prejudice, a useful prelude to the American inquiry.

With these principles and materials in hand the study divided itself into five general phases:

(1) *Field Work*, the visiting of the comparatively large number of institutions—perhaps a hundred—by members of the special staff.

The purpose of the field work is to secure from representative institutions, large and small, data comparable, if possible, concerning all phases of athletic activity and some other extra-curricular interests

<sup>1</sup> Published March 7, 1927. Members may receive copies on request to the offices of the Foundation by mail or in person.



as well, and to frame a conception both general and specific of athletics in their relation to all phases of college and university education. Although the special staff have asked many searching questions at nearly half a hundred institutions,<sup>1</sup> the instances in which they have met with evasion or refusal of information can be numbered thus far upon the fingers of one hand.

(2) *Office Conferences.*—Not only the special staff but also the officers and permanent staff members of the Foundation have talked with numbers of persons at the Foundation's offices. These results are of the first value to the inquiry.

(3) *Correspondence.*—The volume of correspondence has been and continues to be comparatively large. Some of our most illuminating materials have come from this source.

(4) *Research in Printed and Written Materials.*—The first phase of research, according to the general acceptance of the term, emerged early in the inquiry when it became evident that the literature of college athletics would have to be treated and a bibliography put together. A second phase of research, which like the third is taken care of in the offices of the Foundation by the special staff, concerns the excerpting and classification of materials collected in previous studies. The third phase implies scrutiny of many newspapers and periodicals which treat of current and often evanescent aspects and comment concerning sport.

(5) *Special Inquiries.*—Among these may be mentioned the following:

(a) *The Longevity of Athletes.*—The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, through Dr. Louis I. Dublin, Statistician, a group of college teachers headed by Professor Thomas A. Storey of the College of the City of New York, and the Foundation, are cooperating in a study in the life expectation of college athletes, 1865–1905.

(b) *Athletics and Academic Standing.*—The Personnel Research Federation, Dr. W. V. Bingham, Director, is engaged upon a statistical study of the relation of athletics to academic standing at a single university, and a relation of this to similar studies that have been communicated to us by some other institutions. Once the technique is worked out it is hoped that the cooperation of other colleges and universities may be enlisted.

(c) *The Inherited Characteristics of Athletes.*—The Eugenics Record Office, associated with the Laboratory of Experimental Evolution of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, at Cold Spring Harbor,

<sup>1</sup> On March 10, 1927, sixty-five institutions had been visited.

Long Island, Dr. Charles B. Davenport, Director, had undertaken an inquiry into various personal characteristics of athletes.

Four other special fields in which materials are now being collected are (1) alumni, and (2) undergraduate views on college athletics, (3) training regimen and other related matters,<sup>1</sup> and (4) publicity. Undoubtedly other special fields will demand consideration as many already have.

As for the results of the inquiry, we anticipate that they will be published in one bulletin of the Foundation, with perhaps a supplementary publication, or another bulletin, to deal with the literature of the subject. In the first bulletin we expect to discuss among others the following topics, although not in this order: Administration, including organization, control, actual, and theoretical Schedules

Finance, including the use of budgets and reports

The relation of faculties, alumni, and undergraduates to sport

The athletic relations of schools to universities and colleges

Eligibility

The work of conferences

Intercollegiate rivalry

Intramural or mass athletics

Emphasis on athletics and other extra-curricular activities

Athletics and academic standing

Training regimen

Inherited characteristics of athletes

The literature of athletics

Athletics and education in general.

It has been a source of great gratification to all concerned with active work upon the inquiry to receive the cordial encouragement not only of college and university groups, but also of representative sporting organizations and individual sportsmen through the whole of English-speaking North America.

THE LIBERAL COLLEGE.—Nor can it be said that our college faculties are broadly interested in the intellectual life. To remark upon this fact is not to reflect upon our associates in the work of education, to whose earnest devotion we, better than others, can bear witness. We are complaining, not of persons, but of tendencies and circumstances which are inimical to the purpose of the college.

<sup>1</sup> This phase of study is now in the hands of Dr. Dean F. Smiley, Medical Adviser, Cornell University, and Secretary of the American Student Health Association.

We are all painfully aware of the rapid drift in the academic world away from broad scholarship—from liberal culture—towards the disintegration of intellectual interest and activity; towards provincialism in the realm of learning, each little province living its own life, speaking its peculiar dialect, and marked off from every other by strong boundary walls, with the result that the one thing which intellectual workers may not have in common is fellowship in the intellectual life. Nor, finally, can it be said that society at large is much interested in the things of the mind. It may well be that our institutions of education and of religion have made the mistake of regarding man-in-the-making too much as a disembodied spirit. If so, the reaction from that point of view towards a fervid recognition of our animality has been even more than could be desired.

"In the midst of this world, which is increasingly covetous of the A. B. degree, but decreasingly interested in what it is supposed to represent, is the liberal college, with its back to the wall, standing courageously for the emancipation of the human spirit—for the liberation of what Lincoln called 'the better angels of our nature'—insisting that

The seed of God-like power are in us still;

Gods are we, bards, saints, heroes, if we will!

"It seems a rather desperate fight, and perhaps we who believe in the college as an instrument to keep civilization alive do well to scrutinize its armor to see if it be proof and its weapons to see if they be the most effective possible.

"The purpose of the liberal college has been variously defined; perhaps sometimes too narrowly defined. It has been said often, for example, that its aim is to build sound character or to produce good citizenship. These are objectives about which there can be no controversy until these objectives themselves come to be defined. I dare say that we are not ready yet—if we ever shall be—to agree finally on what is sound character, or what is good citizenship. In a civilization which is in a state of flux, life is insurgent against formulas and breaks every mould which we cast in the endeavor to imprison it. Perhaps, therefore, we are wise, if we assume that in a college which pursues the truth in a spirit of scientific reverence, in a college, that is to say, where the scholar-teacher is what, first and foremost, he ought to be—a high priest of learning, the effect upon character and upon citizenship will be such as we would desire.

"May I be pardoned, then, if, passing by such over-definite objectives, and without citing page and paragraph for the source of the

broad definition which I propose for the purpose of discussion, I attempt to say that the purpose of the liberal college is to enable each generation, so far as this can be done by any scheme of formal education, to make its own the struggles and the conquests of past generations in the realm of the human spirit and in the realm of the material universe; this first of all; and second, to enable each generation having thus been made at home in the twofold world in which it has to live, to venture upon further conquests in the region of the unexplored?...

"In this connection, we must be deeply interested, if not deeply concerned, in the tendency, which is now very clear, to dismember the college—to set apart more sharply than we do at present the last two years from the first two years, or even to lop off the first two years and consign them to 'junior colleges' or to whoever may be willing to shoulder the perplexing task of 'profitably prolonging the period of infancy' until students are mature enough to take up in earnest the work of the university. The American Association of University Professors, through its committee on the selection, retention, and promotion of students, now recommends that we eliminate our indifferent or mediocre students at the end of the sophomore year and that we grant them at that point 'honorable dismissal' with all the rights and perquisites of alumni. In other words, it proposes to make the first two years a probationary term to determine whether students are fit for a more exacting senior college. Some of us have already gone further than that: we have proposed to satisfy the ineluctable passion of the American people for the A.B. degree by conferring this degree at the end of the sophomore year—a step which would be only less radical than that suggested some years ago, I think by Barrett Wendell, namely, that we confer the A.B. degree upon every American child at birth, and then grant special certificates for any work done. Mr. Abraham Flexner even sues for a complete divorce of the university from the college on the ground of incompatibility of temperament, the specialization of the university tending, in his opinion, to vitiate the work of the college, and the regimentation of the college tending to vitiate the work of the university—a point of view which seems to be taken by Johns Hopkins and more recently by Stanford in the educational programs which they announce for the future.

"We are familiar with the argument that it is better for the student to sink a shaft deeply here and there into the deposits of knowl-

edge rather than to prospect superficially over a wide expanse, and we are also familiar with the assumption—the great illusion of our academic life—that if a student masters in minute detail a few isolated subjects he will develop a habit of thorough intellectual zeal which will somehow, somewhere, put everything together and open up to him the 'Wide Prospect and the Asian Fen.' But we are equally familiar with the fact that this seldom, if ever, happens in college or after college, and it is beginning to dawn upon us that a college which contents itself largely with introducing the student, however thoroughly, to unrelated fragments of knowledge really robs him of the thrills and the values of the intellectual life...

"In any case, we have had enough of the elective system and almost enough, I dare say, of that ineffectual compromise, the group system as commonly administered, with its loose concentrations and scatterations of the student's activities, which, hardly less than the elective system, leaves his education in the end a thing of shreds and patches. And if we must, at least for the time being, despair of putting into effect the idea of a 'synoptic' curriculum in the broadest sense, are we not prepared to say that the attempt now being made in some colleges—in Princeton, for example—to direct the student systematically through a considerable field of knowledge in such a way that he may be made to see all its parts in relation to the whole is a move in the right direction? After all, the unregenerate group system assumes that just so many fragments, picked up in majors, minors, and electives, constitute, when piled together on the books of the college, an educational integrity. I am speaking of a readjustment or reform of this system—a scheme under which the student selects early in his course a major field of interest, to which in his last two years he devotes the major part of his time, being directed by a responsible adviser to pursue his studies in proper sequence and to fill up any of the inevitable gaps in the curriculum by his independent reading, and being required, furthermore, before he is granted his degree to pass a comprehensive examination on the whole field.

"But even this reform requires not only that we make a change in the manipulation of the curriculum; it requires above all that we restore to the college the type of liberal scholar and teacher whose passing from the academic world has been lamented by us all. Here lies our great difficulty. But we are not without responsibility for his going, and I dare say that in time we can recall him if only we are prepared to give to him—what we have denied to him in the



past quarter century—his due place and his due reward in the college; especially if we can persuade our graduate schools to recognize that not the least important part of their great function is to train scholars who, plucking the flower out of the crannies, will attempt to see in it and make others see in it what God and man is—scholars, I mean, who can teach. After all, it is a question of men. The right sort of men will interest our undergraduates in the intellectual life in spite of all our machinations and our methods. Most of us, fortunately, have even now such men on our faculties, and we thank God for them as we see what they can do with students."

GEORGE NORLIN, in *School and Society*, No. 630.

## LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA.—The recently elected Governor having appointed two regents—supposed to be unfavorable to the continuance of President Marvin—the latter has presented his resignation, and two of the former regents supporting him have followed his example. The local editorial newspaper comments are widely at variance, but there seems to be some appreciation of the necessity of terminating the violent controversy which has so seriously affected the situation for several years.

It may be noted incidentally first that the state legislature passed a resolution expressing confidence in President Marvin and regret at his departure, second that the chief of the office of experiment stations at Washington writes (in part):

"The present action paves the way for a restoration of the College of Agriculture and the experiment station to the position they formerly occupied with such credit, and the return of administrative authority to the constituted head...fortunately the experiment station personnel has remained intact, and with the restoration of confidence and courage the morale should be restored and the work speedily settle down to normal conditions."

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—A *Course for Discussion Leaders* is announced for discussion under the auspices of the University Extension and of a private organization interested in adult education. The course will include seminars and field work as well as class instruction and it is open to graduate students, and to a limited number of others who may be considered qualified by previous experience.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.—The Chapter of the College of the City of New York, after two very interesting meetings with full discussion, adopted unanimously the following report of a special committee on the desirable relations of administrative and teaching duties in the College. The committee of five included two heads of departments.

It is desirable for the College to have the benefit as much as possible of the greater teaching skill and experience of the older members of the Faculty. Also it is important to extend within the Faculty knowledge of administrative problems, by having a large part of the members share in such responsibilities. It is desirable also that the amount of administrative work done through such

offices as a Dean of the Freshman Class, Dean of the Sophomore Class, and advisers for each class should be increased. With such increased participation in the general administrative work of the College the Faculty as a whole can act more intelligently upon the numerous larger questions of college policy. It is also of importance for progress in the work of any educational institution that those men especially fitted for it should have opportunity to carry on research work.

The Committee offers the following recommendations:

1. In general, administrative work should not be so great for any individual as to prevent his doing satisfactory teaching or research work.

2. In administrative work the chairmanship of the more important administrative committees should be considered comparable to the chairmanship of a department. In general, no one professor should be burdened with a double set of such duties, thus interfering with his work in teaching or research.

3. Chairmen of departments should be relieved of routine duties in connection with the ordering and care of supplies, keeping of records, etc., by adequate and efficient secretarial help. The chairman of a committee also should have adequate secretarial aid in making reports and keeping minutes, records, etc. This does not imply that there should be separate secretaries for each department head, but in many cases adequate aid could be provided by having secretaries available in a general office.

4. Each department should function as a committee, in which every member is expected to take interest and to have an active part in determining its policies and improving its work. Regular meetings devoted to department affairs should afford opportunity for such participation.

5. The normal weekly teaching assignment should not exceed fourteen (14) hours for assistant professors, nor twelve (12) hours for associate professors and professors, with reasonable adjustments in case of laboratory and elective courses, and exceptional administrative duties.

OHIO, EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE.—The Seventh Annual Educational Conference sponsored by the Ohio State University will be held at that institution on April 7, 8, and 9, 1927. As in former years the general sessions will be held on Thursday evening, Friday evening,

and Saturday morning. Men of national note, such as Professor E. L. Thorndike of Teachers College, Columbia University, Professor Wallace W. Atwood of Clark University, Judge Olson of the Juvenile Court of Chicago, Payson Smith, Commissioner of Education for Massachusetts, and others will address the general sessions.

Both forenoon and afternoon of Friday will be given over to sectional meetings of which this year there will be more than thirty. Here again specialists in their fields will contribute, as for example, Professor S. A. Courtis of Michigan in the Educational and Intelligence Test Section; Professor S. A. Leonard of Wisconsin in English; Professor Hill of Illinois in Non-biological Science, etc.

The keynote of this year's conference is "Expertness in Teaching" and the whole program, both general and sectional, will center around this idea. The uniform testimony of the thousands who have attended past conferences is that each year the conference is outstanding for its helpfulness, its abundance of ideas, and its lack of mere talk. There is every reason to believe that this year's program equals, if it does not exceed, all former ones.

**WESTERN RESERVE.**—The hundredth anniversary of Western Reserve University was this year marked by a triple commemoration. The first of these commemorated, at Hudson, Ohio, the laying of the corner stone of the first college building. The second consisted of a jubilee series of events devoted especially to the alumni. The last feature of the commemoration took the form of educational conferences, held November 12 and 13, at which were discussed certain vital problems which confront the University at this moment. These included:

### *I. The Junior College Movement*

The Progress and Problems of the Junior College, PROFESSOR LEONARD V. KOOS, *Minnesota*; The Junior College as Seen from the Inside, DR. LEWIS W. SMITH, Joliet, Illinois; The Pasadena Junior College Organization, PRINCIPAL WILLIAM F. EWING, Pasadena, California; The Junior College from the Standpoint of the University, PROFESSOR ROBERT J. LEONARD, *Columbia*.

### *II. The Training of Teachers*

The Working Relation of the School of Education and the Public Schools, PROFESSOR BURDETTE R. BUCKINGHAM, *Ohio State*; The

Teachers' College, DR. WILLIAM F. RUSSELL, Dean-elect of Teachers' College, *Columbia*; The Harvard Plan, PROFESSOR FRANCIS T. SPAULDING, *Harvard*; The Relation of the School of Education to the Graduate Schools of Arts and Sciences, PROFESSOR CHARLES H. JUDD, *Chicago*.

### III. *Research and Training for Research*

Social Trend and the Need of Educational Reconstruction through Research, DEAN GEORGE F. ARPS, *Ohio State*; The Law School as an Agency of Research in Law Reform, DEAN ROSCOE POUND, *Harvard*; The Standards of Graduate Work, DEAN GORDON J. LAING, *Chicago*.

The conferences were attended by about 60 visiting delegates from various parts of the country, besides local representatives, members of the faculties, and educators from the neighborhood.

This form of commemoration was in a sense part of the progress of a large program of development in the University. The outstanding features of this program are as follows.

The recent establishment of "Cleveland College," a part time college with late afternoon and evening classes for graduate and undergraduate credit. Expansion of adult education through this channel is a matter receiving immediate attention.

The Graduate School has been established on an independent basis. Important features of this problem are its relation to the undergraduate colleges and the bringing together of the efforts toward graduate work not only in the arts and sciences, but also in the professional schools of the University. The likelihood of an adequate income promises the possibility of the early realization of these projects.

Reorganization of the courses for the training of teachers has been begun. This looks toward the establishing of a school of education in close relation to the public school system of Cleveland and surrounding municipalities.

Tentative proposals have been made for the care of the rapidly increasing numbers of students in the lower classes of the undergraduate colleges. No definite steps have been taken as yet. The discussions have been in the direction of some form of Junior College.

WISCONSIN.—President Frank's statement on the MacGregor case:

I assume that the facts of the MacGregor case are, by this time,



generally known throughout the state, but I shall rehearse them briefly.

1. Ford H. MacGregor, associate professor of political science and chief of the Municipal Information Bureau, University Extension Division, who is also acting, without salary, as secretary of the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, prepared a bulletin which was issued by the league under the title of A Taxation Catechism.

2. Governor John J. Blaine called my attention to this bulletin in a letter in which he said:

"I have gone through the pamphlet very carefully and find that it is a hodge-podge of lies, half truths, misinformation and misinterpretation, and is misleading and altogether a very unworthy product of a member of the faculty of the university."

In later letters to me and in a letter to Henry Trazler, League of Wisconsin Municipalities, Mr. Blaine suggested that Mr. MacGregor had two courses open to him. The content of Mr. Blaine's letters to me indicated that the two suggested courses were retraction or resignation from the university, with the implication that, in the absence of Mr. MacGregor's taking either of these two courses, the duty of the president of the university was positive.

In arriving at a decision respecting my duty in this matter, I have not undertaken to pass judgment upon the right or wrong of the taxation policies proposed in this bulletin. The MacGregor bulletin cannot, therefore, be taken as representing either my opinion or the general opinion of the university respecting taxation policies. The incident leads into a larger issue, and it is in the light of this larger issue that I have considered it.

Two factors are involved in this controversy:

First: The accuracy of the fact-element in the taxation catechism is challenged by Mr. Blaine.

Second: The opinion-element in the taxation catechism is contrary to the taxation policy sponsored by Mr. Blaine and established in the state.

In this, as in every such case, the administration of the university can concern itself only with the first of these factors. It cannot concern itself with the second of these factors without transforming the university into a press agent for a single group or for a succession of groups.

The university has the right and duty to require from the members of its faculty scientific accuracy and intellectual honesty in their

handling of facts. In their expressions of opinion, the university has no right to require from the members of its faculties conformity to any prevailing theories or policies of the state in particular or of society in general—whether the theories in question be political, economic, social, or religious.

Any member of a faculty of the University of Wisconsin is and must remain as free to agree with or to dissent from any political or economic policy of the state of Wisconsin as he is free to agree with or to dissent from a religious rite in Liberia.

As long as I am president of the University of Wisconsin, complete and unqualified academic freedom will not only be accorded to the members of its faculties, but will be vigorously defended regardless of the pressure, the power, or the prestige that may accompany any challenge of this inalienable right of scholarship. The University of Wisconsin cannot permit political interests, economic interests, or religious interests to censor the opinions of its teachers without sacrificing its self-respect and destroying its value to the state that supports it.

And as long as I am president of the University of Wisconsin, this complete freedom of thought and expression will be accorded with utter impartiality alike to teachers who entertain conservative opinions and to teachers who entertain radical opinions. The fact that I may think, that an official of the state may think, or that a citizen of the state may think a teacher's opinions wrong-headed or even dangerous, will not alter this policy. For the whole of human history presents unanswerable proof, that only through the open and unhampered clash of contrary opinion can truth be found.

To put the matter bluntly: A teacher's opinions, however widely they may differ from prevailing policies and beliefs at the moment, cannot, with my consent, be made a subject of university discipline.

I take this opportunity to restate the well-established Wisconsin tradition of academic freedom, not to suggest that Mr. Blaine has challenged it, for I assume that Mr. Blaine believes in academic freedom as whole-heartedly as I believe in it, and would as readily resent an unwarranted infringement of its practice at the University of Wisconsin. I want only to make clear that the question of the right of a teacher to express his opinions, whether of conformity or of dissent, is not involved in, and cannot, with my consent, be injected into this case.

The administration of the university cannot, therefore, consider

the case of Mr. MacGregor as a case of insubordination on the part of an employee of the state on the ground that he has expressed opinions contrary to a prevailing policy.

The administration of the university can consider the case of Mr. MacGregor only in the light of the charges that Mr. Blaine has made against him of incompetence as a scholar.

Accordingly, the question of the scientific dependability of Mr. MacGregor's work as a member of the staff of the university is being subjected to adequate educational assessment and judgment, exactly as the scientific dependability of the work of a scholar in one of the natural sciences would be looked into, if a serious charge had been made that the scholar in question was ignorant of the facts of his subject, or was juggling the facts of his subject to make a case for a preconceived dogma.

Any decisions that may be reached as a result of this educational assessment and judgment will be made in the light of Mr. MacGregor's value as a member of the educational staff of the university, and without regard to the political implications of any opinions that he may have expressed.

Personally, I think that it is unwise and unfortunate for members of the faculties of a university to express the results of their social and economic studies through the medium of organizations committed in advance to set programs and policies. The value of the University of Wisconsin to the state of Wisconsin, in so far as its studies on the living issues of that state are concerned, depends upon the comprehensiveness and impartiality of its presentation of facts. When a member of a faculty of the university releases the results of his social or economic research through an organization that is conducting a propaganda, he inevitably lays himself open to the suspicion, just or unjust, of a partisanship that is inconsistent with the utmost chastity of scholarship.

I should hesitate, however, to suggest as a university policy, the habitual abstention of university men from participating in all outside movements directed to the promotion of definite programs. Such a policy would prevent teachers from exercising their rights as citizens. And such a policy, in the hands of a blindly reactionary university administration, could be used to prevent the living results of sound social and economic research from coming into contact with the life of the state.

This is why I am so deeply interested in the establishment of the

Wisconsin Institute of Social and Economic Research, proposed by John R. Commons, as an agency that would surround the results of social and economic studies at the university with special guarantee of comprehensiveness and impartiality, and at the same time insure the bringing of such results into living contact with the mind of the state.

## NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following ninety-seven nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions<sup>1</sup> and will be considered by the Committee if received before April 20, 1927.

The Committee on Admissions consists of F. A. Saunders (Harvard), *Chairman*, W. C. Allee (Chicago), Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), A. L. Bouton (New York), J. Q. Dealey (Brown), E. C. Hinsdale (Mt. Holyoke), A. L. Keith (South Dakota), G. H. Marx (Stanford).

Marion L. Ayer (Latin), Mount Holyoke  
Marjorie K. Bacon (Music), Western College  
Albert J. Barlow (Accounting), Virginia  
Horace H. Bass (History), Central Missouri  
Elery R. Becker (Zoology), Iowa State  
A. K. Beik (Education), New York State College  
Clyde Belford (Accounting), Southern California  
Harry Birchenough (Mathematics), New York State College  
Knut Bjorka (Economics), Iowa State  
Forrest C. Blood (Business Administration), Nebraska  
Elmer B. Brown (Education), Central Missouri  
Arthur D. Butterfield (Mathematics and Geodesy), Vermont  
H. Dean Campbell (Accounting), Southern California  
H. M. Chadwell (Chemistry), Tufts  
F. D. Cheydeur (Romance Languages), Wisconsin  
Dana F. Cole (Business Organization), Nebraska  
Earl A. Collins (Education), Central Missouri  
Charles Dean Cool (Romance Languages), Wisconsin  
Carolina Croasdale (Hygiene), New York State College  
Avery O. Craven (History), Illinois  
Wallace McC. Cunningham (Finance), Southern California  
Suzanne Dedieu (Romance Languages), Mount Holyoke  
Horace G. Deming (Chemistry), Nebraska  
Frederick C. Dietz (History), Illinois  
Gilbert H. Doane (Librarian), Nebraska  
C. S. Dorchester (Farm Crops), Iowa State  
George Jacquin Eberle (Commerce), Southern California

<sup>1</sup> Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.



G. R. Elliott (English), Amherst  
 H. C. Filley (Rural Economics), Nebraska  
 Clarence L. Foster (Geology), Syracuse  
 Fred L. Garlock (Economics), Iowa State  
 Ralph H. Harshman (Economics), Mt. Union  
 Robert William Hall (Biology), Lehigh  
 Kenneth G. Hance (English), Olivet  
 Clara Hartley (Biology), Olivet  
 George Hendrickson (Zoology), Iowa State  
 Calvin B. Hoover (Economics), Duke  
 C. B. Hudson (Education), Central Missouri  
 W. H. Hughes (Farm Crops), Iowa State  
 D. Hutchison (Government), New York State College  
 Anton H. Jensen (Romance Languages), Nebraska  
 F. D. Keim (Agronomy), Nebraska  
 W. G. Kennedy (Chemistry), New York State College  
 Earl E. Lackey (Geology), Nebraska  
 Frederic E. Lee (Economics), Maryland  
 John A. Lesh (Economics), Temple  
 James Scott Long (Chemistry), Lehigh  
 Arthur F. Macconochie (Engineering), Virginia  
 Maud McCormick (English), Iowa State  
 Ford H. MacGregor (Political Science), Wisconsin  
 Clarence E. McNeill (Economics), Nebraska  
 Dumas Malone (History), Virginia  
 Harold W. Manter (Zoology), Nebraska  
 C. F. Martin (English), Central Missouri  
 Maynard M. Metcalf (Zoology), Johns Hopkins  
 Elizabeth H. Morris (Education), New York State College  
 Wilson C. Morris (Physics-Chemistry), Central Missouri  
 W. E. Morrow (Economics), Central Missouri  
 Frank E. Mussehl (Poultry Husbandry), Nebraska  
 Albrecht Naeter (Electrical Engineering), Michigan State  
 Andrew J. Newman (Economics), Maryland  
 Walter W. Parker (English), Central Missouri  
 H. A. Phillips (Agriculture), Central Missouri  
 Helen M. Phillips (English), New York State College  
 Pitman B. Potter (Political Science), Wisconsin  
 Carleton E. Power (Physics), New York State College  
 James G. Randall (History), Illinois

J. O. Rankin (Rural Economics), Nebraska  
Charles S. Richardson (Public Speaking), Maryland  
William S. Robertson (History), Illinois  
Herold Truslow Ross (English), Iowa State  
Hazel A. Rowley (Physics), New York State College  
Robert D. Scott (English), Nebraska  
Wilfred W. Scott (Chemistry), Southern California  
Stanley S. Seyfert (Electrical Engineering), Lehigh  
John M. Shaw (Animal Husbandry), Iowa State  
O. E. Shefelveland (Economics), Olivet  
Howard O. Smith (Chemistry), Iowa State  
Helen F. Smith (Mathematics), Iowa State  
Thomas H. Spence (Classical Languages), Maryland  
Ida H. Spurrier (Physical Education), Carnegie  
S. S. Steinberg (Civil Engineering), Maryland  
George W. Stevens (Biology), Central Missouri  
W. M. Stevens (Economics), Maryland  
Sarah C. Stevenson (History), Mt. Union  
Jessie F. Stinard (Spanish), New York State College  
Allen B. Stowe (Chemistry), Olivet  
Walter E. Sullivan (Anatomy), Wisconsin  
Fred W. Urban (Mathematics), Central Missouri  
Alexander Vyssotsky (Astronomy), Virginia  
C. H. Werkman (Bacteriology), Iowa State  
Adam A. Walker (Economics), New York State College  
Fontaine A. Wells (Mathematics), Virginia  
Elsie Wertheim (Applied Art), Iowa State  
Helen C. White (English), Wisconsin  
David D. Whitney (Zoology), Nebraska  
William R. Work (Electrical Engineering), Carnegie